

undated, mostly bilingual inscriptions and from a letter of CONSTANTIUS II cited by Athanasios of Alexandria. F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (*Klio* 39 [1961] 234–48) denied, however, that the ‘Ezānā of the inscriptions was the Aeizana of the letter, and dated ‘Ezānā to the 5th C. The ‘Ezānā of the inscriptions claimed authority over HIMYAR and other lands. In the first half of the 4th C. Frumentius, a captive in Axum, started to organize Christian communities, but Christianity was not yet the state religion in Axum. Frumentius traveled to Alexandria, where Athanasios ordained him bishop of “India” (i.e., ΕΘΙΟΠΙΑ). In the letter to ‘Ezānā and his brother She’azana, Constantius required Frumentius to return to Alexandria ca. 328 and receive ordination from a new Arian patriarch, George. Another attempt to include Axum within the orbit of Byz. influence is reported by Philostorgios, who recounts that THEOPHILOS THE INDIAN visited both Himyar and Axum on his way to the East; since the embassy was sent by Constantius, it is reasonable to suppose that Theophilos negotiated with ‘Ezānā.

LIT. B. & F. Dombrowski, “Frumentius/Abbā Salāmā: Zu den Nachrichten über die Anfänge des Christentums

in Äthiopien,” *OrChr* 68 (1984) 114–69. Yu. Kobishchanov, *Axum* (University Park, Pa.-London 1979) 64–73. A. Dihle, *Umstrittene Daten. Untersuchungen zum Auftreten der Griechen am Roten Meer* (Cologne-Opladen 1965) 36–64. –W.E.K.

**EZERITAI** (Ἐζερίται), one of two groups of SKLAVENOI attested in the Peloponnesos. An etymology from the Slavic *ezero* (lake) is evident; D. Georgacas (*BZ* 43 [1950] 327–30) hypothesized that *ezero* was a translation of the toponym *Helos* (lit. “marsh meadow”) near Taygetos, where the Ezeritai settled. In Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (*De adm. imp.* 50) the Ezeritai are mentioned, along with the MELINGOI, as paying tribute of 300 nomismata; they revolted in the reign of Romanos I, were defeated, and ordered to pay 600 nomismata. Unlike the Melingoi, Ezeritai do not appear in later Byz. sources, but the bishopric of Ezera, in the Peloponnesos, is attested in 1340 (MM 1:218.31).

LIT. Bon, *Péloponnèse* 63, n.2. Vasmer, *Slaven* 167. R. Janin, *DHGE* 16 (1967) 292. –O.P.

**EZRA**<sup>c</sup>. See ZORAVA.

## F

**FABLE** (μῦθος) was considered by rhetoricians as a type of PROGYNMASMA; it had, however, a broader function of communicating a moral message in the form of a short essay with a gnomic conclusion. Classical authors, such as Demosthenes or Aristotle, did not consider fable as a noble genre; it evidently acquired more popularity in the Roman Empire. While Hermogenes treated fable briefly, the rhetorician NICHOLAS OF MYRA (ed. Felten 6–11) devoted an extended paragraph to it. Nicholas defined fable as a fictitious story having no verisimilitude, but illustrating a truth; it dealt either with human beings or animals. Some people also included among fables myths about the gods, but Nicholas considered the latter as a separate genre, *mythika diegemata*. He stressed the fable’s simplicity of language and the inclusion of an *epimythion* or moral.

The earliest fable collection to survive, the so-called *Collectio Augustana*, cannot be precisely dated; the 4th–5th C. is a possible date. Later collections are known throughout the Byz. period (F. Rodríguez Adrados in *La fable* [Geneva 1984] 182). The Byz. imitated ancient fables, esp. those ascribed to AESOP and Babrios (ca. 2nd C.), sometimes paraphrasing and revising them. Some fables are included in the *progymnasmata* of Theon, Libanios, Aphthonios, Theophylaktos Simokattes, Nikephoros Basilakes, and Nikephoros Chrysoberges; some fables exist as chapters in *progymnasmata*, others appear as episodes in lengthier genres. Oriental fables are broadly used in *Barlaam and Ioasaph* and esp. *Stephanites and Ichnelates* of Symeon SEITH. In the Palaiologan period the ANIMAL EPIC was developed out of animal fables.

LIT. F. Rodríguez Adrados, *Historia de la fábula grecolatina*, 2 (Madrid 1985). M. Nøjgaard, *La fable antique*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen 1964–67). Hunger, *Lit.* 1:94–96. J. Vaio, “Babrios and the Byzantine Fable,” in *La fable* (Geneva 1984) 197–224. –A.K.

**FAÇADE** (πρόσοψις, lit. “appearance”), the front or any side of a building designed with the intention of being seen. Initially, the Byz. concept of

the façade was based on classical prototypes; hence its use was restricted to a relatively few public building types such as PALACES (e.g., the façade of the 5th-C. Palace of Theodoric in Ravenna as represented on a mosaic in S. Apollinare Nuovo, RAVENNA) and, even less commonly, churches (e.g., the 5th-C. façade of the Theodosian rebuilding of HAGIA SOPHIA, Constantinople). As the classical tradition in Byz. waned, so did interest in monumental façades. They returned to importance in the 9th–10th C. The façades of such Constantinopolitan churches as the 10th-C. MYRELAION and the 11th-C. PANTEOPTES display a classicizing structural logic. The latter example also exhibits a tripling of recessed arches and pilaster strips, a mannerism characteristic of Komnenian architecture in the capital (e.g., PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY, Kilise Camii, and Gül Camii). At the same time, in various parts of Greece, a very different, unclassical attitude toward façade articulation emerges (e.g., Panagia Gorgoepekoos in Athens, Merbaka near Nauplion, and Hagia Theodora in Arta). Here we find flat walls decorated by continuous horizontal bands and surface textures, in complete disregard of the building’s interior structure. This attitude toward façade decoration becomes even more widespread in the 14th C., with isolated areas of resistance, as at MISTRA, to the general unclassical current.

LIT. K.M. Swoboda, “The Problem of the Iconography of Late Antique and Early Mediaeval Palaces,” *JSAH* 20 (1961) 78–84. S. Ćurčić, “Articulation of Church Façades during the First Half of the Fourteenth Century,” in *L’art byzantin au début du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Belgrade 1978) 17–27. –S.Ć.

**FACTIONS** (from Lat. *factio*; Gr. μέρος, δῆμος or δῆμοι, δημόται; sometimes used as technical term), associations that staged circus games; associations of partisans of any one of the four colors inherited from Rome that competed in CHARIOT RACES. Blues (*Venetoi*) and Greens (*Prasinoi*) were the chief rivals and seem to have cooperated with Whites (*Leukoi*) and Reds (*Rousioi*),



respectively. The theory that factions or DEMOI resembled political parties is now largely abandoned.

Numerous inscriptions and narrative sources show that the factions' importance grew as circus racing spread over the Roman East and factional identities were extended to the theater and its professionals in the late 5th C. Factions sat in special sections, raised monuments to their CHARIOTEERS, and became deeply involved in performing ACCLAMATIONS, as the HIPPODROME and its vast audiences attracted a developing imperial ceremonial. The circus's enhanced political significance—perhaps in tandem with undiagnosed social and economic pressures—aggravated the tendency of excited fans to explode in the insufficiently explained riots that wracked the cities of the late 5th to early 7th C. (e.g., NIKA REVOLT), which contemporaries connected with factional rivalry. Certain neighborhoods seem to have been particularly associated with one or another faction (Gascou, *infra*); the factions could be mobilized to man the walls of their city in crises and they certainly played a role in the civil war between Phokas and Herakleios. Faction members were a small minority of racing fans in 602, when Constantinople counted 900 Blues and 1,500 Greens. Partisans may have been young and come from comfortable backgrounds. By the 8th C. they were headed by DEMARCHOI. Some members' titles reveal specialized functions; those of *melistai* and *poietai* underscore the link with ceremonial acclamations that would typify the factions in the 9th and 10th C.

Factional circus strife vanished after the 7th C.; chariot-racing and factions now became restricted to Constantinople and its environs. *De ceremoniis* details their ceremonial and circus duties; it sometimes distinguishes *peratikoi* factions—headed by *demokratai* (the DOMESTIKOS TON SCHOLON for the Blues and DOMESTIKOS TON EXKOUBITON for the Greens)—from *politikoi* factions, headed by the traditional *demarchoi* (e.g., *De cer.*, bk.1, ch.2, ed. Vogt, 1:29.6–31.17), a distinction which perhaps reflects the suburban or urban origin of their members. These organizations were integrated into the imperial administration: the TAKTIKA place their officers in the imperial hierarchy (see *De cer.*, bk.2, ch.55, ed. Reiske, 798.20–799.16, for the longest list of personnel) and, in the 10th C., the factions were subordinate to and salaried by the *praipositos*. The medieval factions kept their

special Hippodrome seats; they had their own ORGANS, stables and, for their performances, were assigned *phialai* in the Great Palace as well as stations on the routes of imperial PROCESSIONS. Blues were particularly associated with the Virgin of Diakonissa church. Each faction certainly counted more than 50 members (*De cer.*, bk.2, ch.21, ed. Reiske, 617.10–13). They might wear wreaths or crowns (*stephania*) and hold handkerchiefs (*encheiria*) while performing (e.g., *De cer.*, bk.2, ch.15, ed. Reiske, 577.10–12). Ceremonial poems by Theodore PRODROMOS suggest that factionlike groups (*demoi*) were still performing in imperial ceremonies of the 12th C.

LIT. Al. Cameron, *Circus Factions* (Oxford 1976). G. Prinzing, "Zu den Wohnvierteln der Grünen und Blauen in Konstantinopel," in *Studien zur Frühgeschichte Konstantinopels* (Munich 1973) 27–48. J. Gascou, "Les institutions de l'hippodrome en Egypte byzantine," *BIFAO* 76 (1976) 185–212. S. Borkowski, *Inscriptions des factions à Alexandrie* (Warsaw 1981). McCormick, *Eternal Victory* 220–27. G. Vespignani, "Il Circo e le fazioni del Circo nella storiografia bizantinistica recente," *RSBS* 5 (1985) 61–101. —M.McC.

**FACTORIES, IMPERIAL** (ἐργαστήρια βασιλικά). Although production of goods was concentrated in small ERGASTERIA, significant numbers of laborers from certain fields of craftsmanship came under the supervision of state officials. Production of WEAPONS, for example, was largely under state control, as were major construction projects: according to a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 440.19–23), Constantine V assembled 6,900 *technitai* (ARTISANS) from various provinces in order to repair the aqueduct in Constantinople and placed them under the supervision of *archontes ergodioktai* with a *patrikios* at their head. In addition to the production of weapons, imperial factories were involved in minting coins (see MINTS), weaving (GYNAIKEIA), dyeing silk, and making jewelry.

Seals list various ARCHONTES TON ERGODOSION; in Laurent's *Corpus* (vol. 2) are listed 11 *archontes* of the BLATTION, one *archon* of the *chrysoklabon* (luxurious garment), and one of the jewelry factory. In other sources the state production of SILK is most frequently attested: Theophanes (Theoph. 469.3–4) mentions the fire in an imperial workshop (*ergodosion*) of *chrysoklavorioi*; the vita of Antony II Kauleas (ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Sbornik grečeskich i latinskich pamjatnikov*, vol. 1 [St. Petersburg 1899] 18.25) refers to the head of the imperial silk factory; Leo the Deacon (Leo Diac.

146.24–147.2) mentions another head of the imperial *histourgia* under whom a *systema* of weavers labored. Next in frequency are imperial jewelry workshops—in the 10th C. a high-ranking official, the *sakellarios* Anastasios, was *archon* of the *chrysochoeion* (TheophCont 892.14–15). Anna Komnene (An.Komn. 2:10.10) speaks of an imperial "foundry" (*choneia*) where gold and silver were worked. Finally, Nicholas Mesarites describes the ragged crowd of workers at the mint who toiled day and night under the merciless gaze of their overseers.

We do not know how the work in these workshops was organized. It is plausible that some private craftsmen (e.g., LOROTOMOI) were coerced into working in imperial factories; some contingents of imperial craftsmen consisted of people sent there as punishment for a crime: thus, Theodore of Stoudios (PG 99:1249D) writes about a man condemned for icon veneration who was forced to work with the weavers as an imperial slave. Eusebios of Caesarea also considered the workers in imperial GYNAIKEIA as state slaves. According to the *Book of the Eparch*, private artisans' slaves who broke rules could be made into state slaves.

LIT. Kazhdan, *Derevnja i gorod* 336–42. L.C. Ruggini, "Le associazioni professionali nel mondo Romano-Bizantino," *SettStu* 18 (1971) 147f. A.W. Persson, *Staat und Manufaktur im Römischen Reiche* (Lund 1923). Smetanin, *Viz.obščestvo* 77–81. —A.K.

**FACUNDUS**, bishop of Hermiane in Byzacena; died after 571. He was an opponent of Justinian I's religious policies. A leading supporter of the THREE CHAPTERS, Facundus represents the disillusionment of the African hierarchy after Justinian's reconquest. He attended synods in Constantinople in 546 and 547–48; there he wrote a defense of the Three Chapters, maintaining that the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuesia, Ibas of Edessa, and Theodoret of Cyrillus meant the abandonment of the faith of CHALCEDON. In 550 he participated in a council in Africa that condemned Pope VIGILIUS. After the Council of Constantinople in 553 he continued to write and was, at least briefly, excommunicated.

ED. *Opera omnia*, ed. J.M. Clément, R. Vanden Plaetse (Turnhout 1974). PL 67:527–878.

LIT. R.A. Marcus, "Reflections on Religious Dissent in North Africa in the Byzantine Period," *SChH* 3 (Leiden

1966) 140–50. A. Dobroklonskij, *Sočinenija Fakunda, episkopa Germanjskogo, v zaščitu trech glav* (Moscow 1880).

—T.E.G.

**FAIR** (πανήγυρις), an occasional or periodic MARKET, that is, one that is not permanent either in terms of time or in terms of structures such as market stalls and, in this way, is distinguished from regular market days. The Greek term *panegyris* has different meanings, even within the same period and author. Its original meaning being a general gathering, it could refer to a religious FEAST, a public celebration, a commercial fair connected with a religious celebration, or a purely episodic market, as in the promise of Alexios I to the Crusaders to provide them with "abundant fairs." The local fair, attested in many parts of the empire, served the exchange needs of the local population. Libanios provides a classic description of the function of a fair in the 4th C., which was the exchange of products among the inhabitants of various villages of the same locality; the network of exchange thus being formed obviated the need of exchange with the city. In the late 10th and 11th C., there is mention of local fairs where the merchants came both from the vicinity and from other areas, and where therefore the exchange involved more than the locality itself. The periodicity seems to be institutionalized.

Large international fairs are also attested, one such being the fair of CHONAI during the feast of the Archangel Michael, and the fair of THESSALONIKE, connected with the feast of St. Demetrios, for which the TIMARION provides a description. The fairs of the Peloponnesos in the 14th C. seem to fall into an intermediate category.

A tax (KOMMERKION) was levied upon commercial activity at fairs and could be remitted by the emperor or given as a grant. The *kommerkion* of the fair of ERNESUS, remitted in part by Constantine VI in 795, was 100 pounds of gold. In the late 10th C. and after, there is evidence that the powerful, or the communities, or the monasteries of a locality where a fair was constituted, received revenues from the fair. A novel of Basil II (*Zepos, Jus* 1:271f) suggests that the merchants who participated in a fair could act together and choose its locality, their interests taking precedence over those of the person who had rights over the place (cf. also *Peira* 57).



LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 3:270–83. S. Vryonis, Jr., "The Panēgyris of the Byzantine Saint," in *Byz. Saint* 196–227. C. Asdracha, "Les foires en Epire médiévale," *JÖB* 32.3 (1982) 437–46. —A.L.

**FALCONRY.** See HAWKING.

**FALIERI, MARINOS** (Μαρίνος Φαλιέρος), poet; born ca. 1395, died 1474. One of the most prominent feudal landlords of Crete, Falieri played a major role in the island's affairs. As a young man (ca. 1425–30), he (rather than his grandson of the same name, ca. 1470–1527) wrote several short works in rhymed POLITICAL VERSE. Though the *Didactic Discourses* (advice to his son) and the *History and Dream* (a dream encounter in dialogue form between the author and his beloved) owe something to Byz. demotic literature (esp. the SPANEAS poem and the romances BELTHANDROS AND CHRYSANTZA and LIBISTROS AND RHODAMNE), they are also influenced by western European literary currents, in particular those of contemporary Venice. This is even more the case with the *consolatio* (*Rhima Paregoretike*) addressed to his friend Benedetto da Molino. The *Lamentation on the Passion and the Crucifixion* is a dramatic depiction, perhaps based on an icon. The *Erotic Dream*, closely modeled on the *History and Dream* and normally attributed to Falieri, is possibly not by him at all. A man of practical experience rather than wide education (he was familiar with legal Latin and at home in vernacular Greek, while his first language was the Venetian dialect), he—like his predecessors SACHLIKES and Leonardo DELLA PORTA—is a witness to the cultural life of Venetian Crete in the early 15th C.

ED. W.F. Bakker, A.F. van Gemert, eds., "The *Rhima Paregoretike* of Marinos Phalieros," *Studia Byzantina et Neohellenica Neerlandica* (Leiden 1972) 74–195. *The Logoi Didaktikoi of Marinos Phalieros*, ed. idem (Leiden 1977). *Marinou Phalierou Erotika Oneira*, ed. A.F. van Gemert (Thessalonike 1980).

LIT. Beck, *Vollskliteratur* 197–99. A.F. van Gemert, "The Cretan Poet Marinos Falieros," *Thesaurismata* 14 (1977) 7–70. —E.M.J.

**FAMILY.** Although the family was the fundamental unit (MICROSTRUCTURE) of Byz. society, there was no specific word for it in Byz. Greek: the most common term *συγγένεια* (*syngeneia*) designated both the nuclear family and kinship in

general; relationship through marriage is defined or rather described as "connection and joining" (*Basil.* 28:4.1). The term *phamilia/phamelia* (from the Lat. *familia*) is found in some acts of the late 14th–15th C. (*Lavra* 3, nos. 140.15, 161.15; *Dochteiar.*, no. 53.16), where it denotes a family household in contrast to one run by a widow.

The Byz. family was primarily a nuclear family, although extended families of 20–30 members are occasionally mentioned in hagiographical and documentary sources. The frequency of occurrence of extended families varied over time and space. According to A. Laiou (*Peasant Society* 80), in the 14th-C. theme of Strymon families were on the average larger than those in Thessalonike. *Ecloga* 2.2, when prohibiting marriages between members of a *syngeneia*, lists the following categories of relatives: parents, children, brothers, sisters, and *exadelphoi*, that is, nephews and nieces; then follow relations by affinity—stepfather/stepmother, father/mother-in-law, brother/sister-in-law, etc. Relations between uncle and nephew were often very close (J. Bremmer, *ZPapEpig* 50 [1983] 173–86). A family could also include adoptive children (see ADOPTION) and such members of the household as MISTHIOI—as potential husbands of a master's daughter.

The nuclear family formed the household and was the main economic unit in both town and countryside. The husband and wife worked side by side in the fields or in the workshop, and children (see CHILDHOOD) were involved in household activities from an early age, esp. in the country where they herded their parents' swine or sheep; in cities, the boy might leave the family at an early age to become an apprentice. The Byz. family was a much more cohesive unit than the late Roman family: MARRIAGE was concluded by a solemn MARRIAGE RITE and not mere consensus (A. Laiou, *RJ* 4 [1985] 189–201); CONCUBINAGE was, at least in theory, abolished; DIVORCE was restricted; BETROTHAL was equated to marriage; the property of the husband and wife was administered as common effects with overlapping rights to both portions.

Although the nuclear family was the cornerstone of Byz. social organization, it was nevertheless limited by several factors. It was viewed as a concession to the frailty of human nature and as taking second place to eremitism (see HERMIT) and CELIBACY, which occupied a higher rung on

the ladder of values. In some instances the state controlled the family. Not only were princely marriages often concluded on the basis of political considerations—resulting sometimes in personal tragedies—but on occasion the state imposed marriages (some nuns were compelled to marry monks during the period of Iconoclasm, widows and maidens were sometimes forced to marry foreign mercenaries) or made a couple divorce if the union was considered socially improper. The state also exercised the right to ΑΒΙΟΤΙΚΙΟΝ, appropriation of a certain part of the inheritance left by the deceased head of the family (if he died intestate) to the detriment of his relatives. Although kinship and LINEAGE were underdeveloped in comparison with countries of western and northern Europe, they still played a certain role and influenced the functioning of the nuclear family. Some distant relatives were entitled to certain rights, such as PROTIMESIS in the sale of land. The rights of the individual within the family were emphasized: there was no right of primogeniture in Byz. law, and the family property had to be divided, at least in theory, among the children of the *pater familias* (often in equal parts between brothers and sisters) and in this way dispersed, unless the relatives agreed to retain the unity of their properties. For example, in 13th-C. Trebizond, five relatives (*syngonikarchioi*) possessed land collectively (*Vazelon*, nos. 43, 44).

As in the West, monks did not marry and produce new families, and monastic propaganda urged children to leave the family and sever their links with their parents. On the other hand, some monks and nuns maintained connections with their close relatives, entered the same (or a neighboring) community, or created artificial, familylike small units. Moreover, unlike the West, Byz. priests and deacons (but not bishops) were allowed to be married. In addition to monks and nuns, there were other groups of people who did not marry but maintained familial relationships: eunuchs who could not procreate children nonetheless preserved close ties with their nephews; teachers of ecclesiastical/state schools who frequently remained single (in expectation of an episcopal see) and favored their nephews; men who kept concubines. Slaves were not permitted to have a legitimate family (at least until the 11th C.), although they did have monogamous unions.

Along with strengthening of family links over

time, there was increasing prestige of the woman as wife and mother whose role in the household was decisive. The warmth of relations between parents and children is often stressed in Byz. literature—in evident disregard for the demands of some rigorists (e.g., the author of the vita of St. ALEXIOS HOMO DEI) who praised the dissolution of family ties. Some heretical dogmas, for example those of extreme Dualist sects, went so far as to advocate the total abolition of the family and rejected sexuality and procreation. As a pivotal institution of social life, the family served as a model for structuring other types of social relations. The emperor was proclaimed to be the father of his subjects, and family terminology was used to describe both his relations to neighboring rulers and some hierarchical ranks (e.g., GAMBROS, son-in-law); family terminology characterized the relationship of the teacher to his disciples (his "sons" or "nephews"), esp. within the sphere of spiritual influence; the concept that in the monastery the spiritual father replaced the biological parents was widespread in Byz.

LIT. J. Irmscher, "Frau, Ehe, Familie in Byzanz," *Jahrbuch für Geschichte des Feudalismus* 9 (1985) 9–18. E. Patlagean, "Christianisation et parents rituelles; le domaine de Byzance," *Annales ESC* 33 (1978) 625–36. W.C. Thompson, *Legal Reforms of the Iconoclastic Era: The Changing Economic Structure of the Family* (Madison 1976). D. Simon, "Zur Ehegesetzgebung der Isaurier, Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte," *FM* 1 (1976) 16–43. A. Laiou, "Contribution à l'étude de l'institution familiale en Epire au XIIIe siècle," *FM* 6 (1984) 275–323. A. Kazhdan, "Hagiographical Notes," *Byzantion* 54 (1984) 188–92. —A.K.

**FAMILY 2400.** See DECORATIVE STYLE.

**FAMINE** (λιμός). In a marginally subsistent agricultural economy such as that of Byz., famine followed any climatic irregularity that interfered with agricultural, esp. grain, production. Byz. chronicles and saints' lives regularly record the harsh winters, droughts, floods, and plagues of locusts that jeopardized the annual harvest. Because God provided for mankind, any disruption to that provision was interpreted as a sign of divine displeasure with a particular situation or event, as in the case of the famine that followed the deposition of Elias as patriarch of Jerusalem in 516 (CYRIL OF SKYTHOPOLIS, *Vita Sabae*, ch. 58, ed. Schwartz 159.7–14). Since BREAD was a staple dietary requirement for the Byz. population, a



failed harvest could lead to high mortality. Famines were usually localized, affecting first the countryside, then the nearby cities. Larger urban centers, esp. Constantinople, could sometimes delay the impact of famine by controlling the storage and distribution of grain, but shortages could still lead to riots as in the capital in 409 and 602.

Major famines occurred in 383–85 (Antioch), 443 (Constantinople), 499–502 (Edessa), 516–21 (Palestine), early 540s, early 580s, 600–03 (Syria), under Basil I (Skyl. 277f), 927/8 (“the great famine”), 1032 (Cappadocia and neighboring areas), and 1037 (Thrace and Macedonia). From the second half of the 11th C. and the 12th C. data on famines are rare (Kazhdan-Epstein, *Change* 27, n. 11). Turkish invasions of the 14th–15th C. often resulted in famines, as did the “scorched earth” policy of Andronikos II when combatting the Catalan Grand Company in 1306 (A. Laiou, *Byzantium* 37 [1967–68] 91–113). The results of famine were esp. severe in spring when stored grain had been exhausted; women evidently had a higher mortality rate during famines than men. Famine and the miraculous help of a saint is a frequent theme of hagiographical literature.

LIT. Patlagean, *Pauvreté* 74–92. Svoronos, *Études*, pt.IX (1966), 12f. —B.C.

**FAN, LITURGICAL.** See RHIPIDION.

**FANTINUS THE YOUNGER.** See PHANTINOS THE YOUNGER.

**FARMER'S LAW** (Νόμος Γεωργικός), a legal text preserved in dozens of MSS from the end of the 10th C. onward. It regulates relations within a village (theft, trespassing of boundaries, damage caused by or to livestock, etc.) or, rarely, between two villages; a tax (*extraordina*) is mentioned only once; two kinds of land lease are regulated, but not land purchase. There has been considerable discussion of the date, provenance, and character of this law code. It has been dated to the 7th C. (particularly to the reign of Justinian II) and to the 8th C. (as contemporaneous with the *Ecloge*). Its origin has been placed in Italy and in Constantinople—the absence of any reference to olive groves and horses in the Farmer's Law suggests,

however, an origin in hilly, inland terrain. It has been variously viewed as a record of Slavic customary law (even though not a single Slavic term is to be found there); as a selection of Justinianic norms (the name of Justinian—I or II?—is included in some MSS); as pre-Justinianic rules; as biblical, eastern, or Hellenic precepts; as imperial legislation; and as a private collection.

Whatever its provenance, the Farmer's Law reflects conditions in the countryside (limited to certain territories), between the crisis of the mid-7th C. and the 9th-C. revival. Its context is a milieu in which the free peasantry dominates, slaves appear only as shepherds, and ownership of large landed estates is practically unknown. Of 85 articles of the Farmer's Law, 40 deal with cattle breeding, livestock damaging crops, etc., whereas only 16 are devoted to land cultivation and related questions, nine to vineyards and gardens, two to agrarian implements, and four to houses and barns. Like Western medieval *leges*, the Farmer's Law protected the animal from the neighbor (pars. 38, 50, 51, 53, 54, 85) rather than the neighbor's crop from an animal that caused damage (pars. 78–79). The peasants described in this law own their individual allotments, while some portion of the village land is in common ownership. The relations are similar to those described in the Western *leges barbarorum*, but it is unnecessary to seek for explanation in a direct borrowing (e.g., from the Italian Lombards)—a similar situation could create similar regulations. The Farmer's Law was revised by HARMENOPOULOS and translated into Rumanian and Slavic languages.

ED. and LIT. I. Medvedev, E. Piotrovskaja, E. Lipšic, *Vizantijskij zemledel'českij zakon* (Leningrad 1984). Eng. tr. W. Ashburner, “The Farmer's Law,” *JHS* 32 (1912) 68–95. J. Karayannopoulos, “Entstehung und Bedeutung des Nomos Georgikos,” *BZ* 51 (1958) 357–73. J. Malafosse, “Les lois agraires à l'époque byzantine,” *Recueil de l'Académie de législation* 19 (1949) 1–75. N. Pantazopoulos, “Peculiar Institutions of Byzantine Law in the *Georgikos Nomos*,” *RESEE* 9 (1971) 541–47. —A.K.

**FARM.** Usually designated as STASEIS in fiscal documents, farms varied with regard to their size and location. A regular farm consisted of a house with its enclosure and well; within the enclosure were also sheds for hay and straw, pits (*goubai*) for grain, *pitharia* (large, partially buried vessels for wine and other products), and sometimes wine

presses, animal-driven mills, and stalls. The most valuable parts of the farm were called AUTOURGIA. The farm encompassed arable land, GARDENS, olive groves, and VINEYARDS as well as the right to use common pastures (usually located in wooded hills), but products varied according to terrain and climate: some villages had practically no arable land, others did not cultivate olives or grapes; some farms were oriented toward FISHING or the breeding of LIVESTOCK.

The nucleus of the farm usually formed a part of the VILLAGE, whereas the land consisted of small scattered parcels (up to 25–33 pieces) planted in such a way that vineyards could border CHORAPHIA, etc. There were no “open fields” or systematic redistributions of allotments, but parcels formed stable units normally surrounded by fences and ditches. Besides the principal homestead, a *stasis* could include hamlets (*agridia*) located far from the nucleus. Large landowners had farms called PROASTEIA and (as monastic property) METOCHIA, which were sometimes separated from the center of the estate by significant distances.

LIT. M. Kaplan, “L'économie paysanne dans l'Empire byzantin du Vème au Xème siècle,” *Klio* 68 (1986) 198–232. Laiou, *Peasant Society* 142–222. A. Kazhdan, “Vizantijskoe sel'skoe poselenie,” *VizVrem* 2 (1949) 215–44. —J.W.N., A.K.

**FASTING** (νηστεία), freely chosen total or partial self-deprivation of, or abstinence from, certain kinds of food and drink, usually for a predetermined period, as a means of penance and asceticism. Fasting was practiced either in common, before major feasts of the church, or individually, under the discretion of a spiritual elder. In early Christianity, fasting meant total abstinence from food and drink at least until evening. Later the notion of fasting was extended to include reduction in the quantity of, or abstinence from only certain kinds of, victuals.

On the symbolic or liturgical level, Christian fasting was related to expectation of the PAROUSIA, and thus partook of the nature of a VIGIL; first seen in this way in Asia Minor in the 2nd C. in conjunction with the vigil on the eve of Easter, this fast was later extended to the two days, then to the entire week, preceding Easter (whence HOLY WEEK), finally to 40 days (whence *Tessarakoste*, or LENT), to which was prefixed later, in the 6th–

7th C., a pre-Lenten “Cheesefare Week.” Other lents of the church year, and fasting on the vigils of Nativity and Epiphany, and on two feasts—the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 Sept.) and the Beheading of John the Baptist (29 Aug.)—were also added. The Byz. system of fasts was completely in place by the 11th C.

The daily eucharistic fast from midnight until COMMUNION, in general use from the 5th C. onward, is also to be understood as a vigil for the coming of the Lord. This symbolism is the basis for forbidding fasting on Saturdays and Sundays and during the 50-day season of PENTECOST, since these times signified the presence of the Risen Lord, the fulfillment of the Messianic age, symbolized in the Bible by banqueting.

From the 4th C. onward, tradition distinguishes various degrees of fasting, from the total Easter fast of one or more days, to giving up meat (*apokreas*) or cheese (*tyrine*). *Xerophagia* (“dry nourishment”) was a fast that lasted until evening, followed by a meal of only bread, salt, and water. Even the Eucharist was thought to break this fast; hence Byz. fast days were “aliturical,” that is, on these days the Eucharist, being a morning service, was either not celebrated at all, or was replaced by the PRESANCTIFIED. In addition to lents, Monday (in monasteries), Wednesday, and Friday were traditional fast days except during the 50 days of Pentecost. Fasting included abstinence from marital relations. Monks practiced more severe and frequent fasting than the laity and never ate meat (E. Jeanselme, *2<sup>e</sup> Congrès d'histoire de la médecine* [Evreux 1922] 1–10).

Church fathers preached on fasting, and it occupies a prominent place in monastic literature (H.-J. Sieben, *DictSpir* 8 [1974] 1175–79) and in hagiographical texts. Saints might refuse even bread for certain periods and feed instead on wild berries, acorns, or dried locusts; the infant NICHOLAS refused to nurse on fast days, a sure sign of future sanctity. Yet excessive fasting was criticized by some intellectuals as hypocrisy: if we leave our poor brother to fast and die of hunger, says Eustathios of Thessalonike (*Escorial Y II* 10, fol.39v), this is not *nesteia* but *lesteia*, robbery.

LIT. J. Schümmer, *Die altchristliche Fastenpraxis* (Münster 1933). H. Musurillo, “The Problem of Ascetical Fasting in the Greek Patristic Writers,” *Traditio* 12 (1956) 1–64. J. Herbut, *De ieiunio et abstinentia in ecclesia Byzantina ab initis*



*usque ad saec. XI* (Rome 1968). P. de Meester, "Règlement des bienheureux et saints pères Sabas-le-Grand et Théodose-le-Cénobiarque pour la vie des moines cénobites et kelliotes." *Bulletin des Oblates Séculières de Sainte Françoise Romaine et de l'Union Spirituelle des Veuves de France* (Lille 1937) 6-13. —R.F.T., A.K.

**FATE.** See DETERMINISM; TYCHE.

**FĀṬIMIDS**, Shiite Muslim dynasty (909-1171). Its first four caliphs lived in North Africa until Fāṭimid armies captured Egypt in 973. The Fāṭimids first clashed with Byz. in 911 at Demona (Sicily). Between 914 and 918 the Byz. governor of Sicily agreed to pay an annual tribute of 22,000 gold pieces, which Romanos I succeeded in reducing to 11,000. Byz. diplomatic contacts with the Fāṭimids included embassies in 946, 953 (truce), and 957/8 (five-year truce), and treaties in 967 and 975. The Byz. unsuccessfully attempted to prevent Fāṭimid expansion in northern Syria, which was partitioned *de facto* in 969. Caliph al-Muʿizz failed to prevent the Byz. reconquest of Crete. Caliph al-ʿAzīz persuaded Byz. in 987/8 to lift the prohibition against commercial contacts and to allow prayers in his name to be recited in the mosque of Constantinople. He died preparing a major expedition against Byz. as protector of the ḤAMDĀNIDS. A Fāṭimid fleet defeated Byz. in 998, resulting in a ten-year truce in 1001. After Caliph al-Ḥākīm destroyed the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, commercial relations were severed from 1015/16 until 1032. A ten-year treaty, which included permission for Byz. rebuilding of this church, was signed in 1038 and renewed in 1048. Relations cooled after Constantine IX died but briefly improved under Isaac I because of common fear of the Seljuks. Seljuk and Crusader invasions separated Byz. and Fāṭimid territories, but diplomatic and commercial contacts continued until the end of the Fāṭimid dynasty.

LIT. A. Hamdani, "Byzantine-Fatimid Relations Before the Battle of Mantzikert," *BS/EB* 1 (1974) 169-79. M. Canard, *EF* 2:855. Vasiliev, *Byz. Arabes* 2.1:221f, 225-28. —W.E.K.

**FAYYŪM** (from Coptic Phiom or Piom, the sea), area of Middle Egypt where agriculture was highly developed in Ptolemaic and early imperial times; its capital was Arsinoë (Crocodylopolis). By the early 4th C. the prosperity of the Fayyūm had

declined and several settlements were abandoned, but papyrus finds attest to the continuity of the chief city through the 7th C. Churches have been excavated at Tebtynis, Madīnat Mādī, and Hawāra. They are generally of basilican plan, with a tripartite sanctuary, but are provincial in character, the nave being often no wider than the aisles. Nearly all the columns are *spolia*. Medieval sources (al-Nāblūsī, *Description du Fayoum au VII<sup>e</sup> siècle de l'Hégire* [Cairo 1899; rp. Beirut 1974]; see the excerpts of G. Salmon, *BIFAD* 1 [1901] 29-77) refer to numerous monasteries, of which only a few have left traces. Some sites still called "Dayr" (monastery) have early churches: Dayr al-Naqlūn (also Dayr al-Malak Ghabriyāl) has parts of a 7th-C. basilica; and Dayr al-Banāt, near Dayr al-Naqlūn, is a ruined monastic site with remains of a church and refectory. The region is particularly known for its FAYYŪM PORTRAITS.

LIT. E. Bresciani, "Medinet Madi nel Fayum: Le chiese," *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 7 (1984) 1-15. S. Adli, "Several Churches in Upper Egypt," *MDAI K* 36 (1980) 1-14. —P.G.

**FAYYŪM PORTRAITS**, funerary portraits that survive in large numbers from the FAYYŪM. The practice of covering the faces of mummies with images painted on wooden panels began during the Roman occupation of Egypt, when the native population could no longer afford the traditional, elaborate SARCOPHAGI. At first naturalistic, such portraiture had become increasingly abstract by the time it went out of fashion in the 4th C. The importance of Fayyūm portraits for Byz. art is twofold: on the one hand, their realistic detail offers parallels for contemporary jewelry and clothing, and on the other, their shape, encaustic technique, and abstract, hieratic style contributed instrumentally to the development of 5th-7th-C. ICON painting.

LIT. G. Grimm, *Die römischen Mumienmasken aus Ägypten* (Wiesbaden 1974). A.F. Shore, *Portrait Painting from Roman Egypt* (London 1972). K. Parlasca, *Mumienporträts und verwandte Denkmäler* (Wiesbaden 1966). K. Weitzmann, *The Icon* (New York 1978) 9. —G.V.

**FEAR** (φόβος) was divided by Nemesios (PG 40:688B-689A) and John of Damascus (*De fid. orth.* par.29, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:81) into six categories: *oknos*, hesitation or fear of future ac-

tions; *aidos*, awe or fear of blame; *aischyne*, shame or fear of having acted dishonestly; *kataplexis*, consternation at the sight of a great imaginary apparition; *ekplexis*, terror caused by an unusual apparition; and *agonia*, anguish or fear of failure. John of Damascus (*De fid. orth.* 64.10, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:162) considered cowardice and anguish to be physical EMOTIONS, expressed in ways such as sweating and "clots of blood" (Lk 22:44).

Church fathers interpreted fear mostly as a spiritual emotion. Basil the Great (PG 29:369C) distinguished between a good fear, which brings salvation, and a base fear caused by lack of faith. The good fear was fear of God (often in the formula "fear and trembling [*tromos*]"), which was contrasted with fear of punishment (and with the fear the Hebrews felt before God). In Symeon the Theologian *phobos tou Theou* is a complete and voluntary subjugation to God, self-abnegation and transformation of oneself into a slave of God.

A secular parallel to Symeon's fear is Kekaumenos's fear of the ever-present dangers that threaten man in every aspect of his life, such as perils of nature (poisonous mushrooms, falling rocks) or of human relationships (traps laid by friends or subordinates) or of the imperial court with its danger of disfavor. The Byz. felt themselves surrounded by dangerous NATURAL PHENOMENA (earthquakes, storms, drought, locusts, etc.), political turmoil (enemy invasions, rebellions), and social instability; it required enormous faith to overcome fears and maintain optimism. The usage of metaphors implying fear (shipwreck, fire, disease, death) was esp. typical of Niketas Choniates, distinguishing him from Psellos and Gregoras, who stressed the possibility of a happy end after severe trials. —A.K.

**FEAST** (ἑορτή, πανήγυρις). Byz. daily life was dominated by a succession of festivals, whether these were the recurring ones of the liturgical YEAR, or sporadic ones on the occasions of imperial WEDDINGS, TRIUMPHS, or other CEREMONIES. Manuel I's list of feasts (1166) counts 66 full *panegyreis* (without Sundays) and 27 half-feasts (R. Macrides, *FM* 6 [1984] 140-55).

The liturgical feasts, both "mobile" and "fixed," are recorded in church CALENDARS. Feasts can be "dominical" (*despotikai*, of Christ), "Marian" (*Theometorikai*, of the Virgin Mary), "sanctoral" (of the

saints), or "occasional" (commemorating the founding of a city, the consecration of a church, a council, a miracle, a transfer of relics, a natural calamity, etc.). They may even celebrate a dogma or its triumph, e.g., "Trinity Sunday" or the TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY. There is a cycle of fixed commemorations for every weekday, while SUNDAY always commemorates the Resurrection. Ceremonial for the various feasts is described in the liturgical TYPICON.

In the *Typikon of the Great Church*, more important feasts were preceded by a VIGIL (*paramone*), but NATIVITY, EPIPHANY, and Exaltation of the Cross (see CROSS, CULT OF THE) were the only fixed feasts with a fore- and afterfeast (Mateos, *Typicon* 2:294, 311). Later, SABAITIC TYPIKA distinguished five different ranks of festive solemnity: two classes of GREAT FEAST (dominical and Marian), Middle Feasts, Lesser Feasts, and days of simple commemoration. Only Great Feasts and a few important Middle Feasts merited an all-night vigil, or *agrypnia*; they may be preceded by a period of FASTING. Apart from that, these categories affected chiefly the celebration of ORTHROS and VESPERS. Only on Great Feasts did the festal KANON replace at *orthros* the *kanon* of the movable cycle found in the OKTOECHOS, TRIODION, or PENTEKOSTARION. Middle Feasts had Great Vespers and the Great DOXOLOGY at *orthros*, but no vigil. Lesser Feasts had the Great Doxology at *orthros*, but only simple vespers. These categories were not rigid, however, and sometimes elements that (ideally) pertain to feasts of one class were assigned to a feast of a different rank.

Many feasts in Constantinople involved the participation of the emperor. On dominical feasts, he attended services in HAGIA SOPHIA, on the Marian feasts he proceeded to the CHALKOPRAITEIA or BLACHERNAI churches, while on the Thursday of HOLY WEEK he performed the ceremonial WASHING OF THE FEET mandated by Jesus in John 13:14. Numerous saints' days also included solemn processions around the city (see LITE). A certain number of guests were usually invited to dine at the palace after the feast and could be entertained by MIMES. The main sources for the emperor's activities on these days are the *Kletorologion* of PHILOTHEOS, DE CEREMONIIS, and pseudo-KODINOS.

Food and wine were usually distributed to the population in the city squares, or to the poor



before monastery gates. Feasts were also accompanied by games in various forms, from horse races to semitheatrical performances. Christopher of Mytilene describes a masquerade, a procession of notaries in costume, one dressed as the emperor, on the feast of their patrons Sts. Markianos and Martyrios (25 Oct.). In the 14th C. the church assumed the staging of biblical stories on feast-days, esp. that of the THREE HEBREWS. (For the fairs that accompanied feastdays, see PANEGYRIS.)

LIT. A. Stoelen, "L'année liturgique byzantine," *Irenikon* 4.10 (1928) 1-32. M. Arranz, "Les 'fêtes théologiques' du calendrier byzantin," in *La liturgie, expression de la foi*, ed. A.M. Triacca, A. Pistoia (Rome 1979) 29-55. A. Kazhdan, *LMA* 4:405-07. McCormick, *Eternal Victory* 131-259. A. Laiou, "The Festival of 'Agathe,'" in *Festschrift Stratou* 1:111-22. -R.F.T.

**FEAST OF ORTHODOXY.** See TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY.

**FEEDING OF THE MULTITUDE.** Christ's miraculous multiplication of five loaves and two fishes to feed 5,000 people occurs in all four Gospels; a similar episode with 4,000 people (Mt 15:32-39, Mk 8:1-10) was amalgamated with it in both exegesis and art. Suggesting the bread of the EUCHARIST and its ability to sustain all who come, the scene occurs repeatedly in art of the 4th-6th C., often in conjunction with the miracle at CANA. Initially, it is shown schematically, with only baskets and fishes; 6th-C. versions use figures, but formally, with a frontal Christ blessing food presented by symmetrically placed disciples. The 6th-C. Sinope Gospels (A. Grabar, *Les peintures de l'Évangéliste de Sinope* [Paris 1948], pl.III) show bread baskets and people picnicking beside this symmetrical group; this version recurs in 9th-C. monuments. The Feeding is infrequent in later art, appearing only in extensive cycles, but it does develop, becoming more narrative in form. Its eucharistic significance is acted out rather than symbolized, as the symmetrical composition is displaced by scenes of the breaking and distribution of the bread (Monreale-Demus, *Norman Sicily*, pl.87A-B). This development culminates in richly discursive Palaiologan representations, esp. that at the CHORA.

LIT. Grabar, *Martyrium* 2:247-54. Underwood, *Kariye Djami* 4:285-88. -A.W.C.

**FELIX III**, pope (13 Mar. 483-1 Mar. 492). Born to an aristocratic Roman family, Felix was elected with the support of ODOACER and tried, at the beginning, to maintain correct relations with Emp. Zeno despite Rome's opposition to the HENOTIKON. Pressure from the Chalcedonian Alexandrian clergy hardened Felix's anti-Monophysite position, although his legates—willingly or not—entered into communion with Patr. AKAKIOS; Felix demanded deposition of the Monophysite Alexandrian patriarch PETER MONGOS and excommunicated the legates and Akakios, thus leading to the AKAKIAN SCHISM (484). He found support among certain circles in Constantinople, esp. the AKOIMETOI. The three failed attempts to resolve the schism in Felix's lifetime fit into the broader context of Byz. policies toward Odoacer and THEODORIC THE GREAT. One of Felix's collaborators was the future pope GELASIUS. The two men contributed much to the increasing papal independence from Constantinople in the realm of dogma.

LIT. Richards, *Popes* 59-62. P. Nautin, "La lettre de Félix III à André de Thessalonique et sa doctrine sur l'Église et l'Empire," *RHE* 77 (1982) 5-34. Idem, "La lettre 'Diabolicae Artis' de Félix III aux moines de Constantinople et de Bithynie," *REAUG* 30 (1984) 263-68. -A.K.

**FENARI ISA CAMIL.** See LIPS MONASTERY.

**FEODOSIJ OF PEČERA**, superior of the Kievan Caves monastery, or Kievo-pečerskij monastyr' (ca.1060-74); saint; born Vasil'ev, died Kiev 3 May 1074; feastday 3 May. Feodosij (Theodosios) is regarded as the founder of cenobitic monasticism in Rus' for having introduced into the Caves Monastery the Rule of STODIOS, which he obtained either from a Kievan monk residing in a Constantinopolitan monastery (according to Feodosij's vita by the monk NESTOR) or from Michael, a Stoudite monk who had accompanied Metr. George (ca.1065-76) to Kiev from Constantinople (according to the POVEST' VREMNYCH LET sub anno 1051). The monastery's PATERIK (13th C.) also credits Feodosij with hiring Byz. architects from Constantinople to build the monastery's stone Church of the Dormition (founded in 1073). Some 20 written works are attributed to him with varying degrees of certainty. His brief Lenten homilies, which have the best claim to authenticity,

chiefly concern monastic discipline and repeatedly stress the authority of THEODORE OF STODIOS. A virulent anti-Latin tract and a letter on fasting attributed to Feodosij are more likely the works of another Feodosij ("the Greek," fl. mid-12th C.), who also translated into Slavonic the letter of Pope LEO I to Patr. Flavian of Constantinople.

ED. I.P. Eremin, "Literaturnoe nasledie Feodosija Pečerskogo," *TODRL* 5 (1947) 159-84.

SOURCE. Nestor's vita—*Uspenskij sbornik*, ed. S.I. Kotkov (Moscow 1971) 71-135. *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality*, ed. G.P. Fedotov (New York 1952).

LIT. R. Casey, "Early Russian Monasticism," *OrChrP* 19 (1953) 372-423. Podskalsky, *Rus'* 89-93, 177-84. Fedotov, *Mind* 1:110-36. -S.C.F., P.A.H.

**FEOFAN GREK.** See THEOPHANES "THE GREEK."

**FERRARA** (Φερ(ρ)αρία), city in Emilia, in northern Italy. The city was evidently founded in the early 7th C., at which time a fortress was built on the left bank of the Po; by the 12th C., however, the Po had changed its course, and by 1438, when Emp. John VIII Palaiologos came to Ferrara, the closest point of disembarkation seems to have been Francolino, about 10 km from Ferrara (Syropoulos, *Mémoires* 226.23-24). The fortress belonged to the exarchate of Ravenna, was captured by the Lombards, and in 757 transferred to Pope Stephen II by the Lombard king Desiderius. Under the rule of its Countess Mathilda (1063-1115) the city supported the popes (esp. GREGORY VII) against Henry IV of Germany. For several centuries Ferrara struggled against the ecclesiastical supremacy of Ravenna and the political claims of Venice. At the initiative of Pope Eugenius IV, Ferrara housed the Council of FERRARA-FLORENCE during its first phase in 1438 until an outbreak of plague forced the participants to move to Florence. The city seems to have had a small Greek colony concentrated around the Church of St. Julian, near which Dionysios, metropolitan of Sardis, was buried in Apr. 1438 (V. Laurent in Syropoulos, *Mémoires* 257, n.5). -A.K.

**FERRARA-FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.** The council opened at Ferrara (1438-39). It was, however, transferred to Florence on account of the plague. Viewed by Rome as ecumenical, the council aimed at the UNION OF THE CHURCHES. Its

convocation was a concession to the Byz., since Rome had previously refused to accept their demands for a free and open council in which both parties would be treated as equals. All the same, East-West antagonism remained. The papacy looked with contempt on the ruined Byz. Empire and strove for the political subordination of the Greek church, while traditional Byz. distrust of and frustration and disillusion with the West were still very much alive. Besides, the atmosphere was politically conditioned from the beginning. The large Byz. delegation, which included the patriarch of Constantinople, JOSEPH II, and Emp. JOHN VIII PALAIOLOGOS, was also seeking military aid against the Turks.

Despite the council's prolonged deliberations on the controversial issues—papal PRIMACY, FILIOQUE, PURGATORY, AZYMES—genuine unity was not achieved. Indeed, the basic issues were not fully resolved. Both papal primacy and the *filioque* were defined in Latin terms. A crucial argument for union, moreover, lost its persuasiveness soon after the council, when the military crusade promised by Pope EUGENIUS IV was destroyed at the battle of VARNA (1444). Not surprisingly, the union decree (6 July 1439) of this council proved just as ephemeral as the union of LYONS (1274). The Byz. church officially repudiated it shortly after the collapse of the empire. Both the *Memoirs* of Sylvester SYROPOULOS and the acts of the council itself are unofficial compilations, reflecting their authors' individual views and perspectives.

SOURCES. *Quae Supersunt Actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini*, ed. J. Gill (Rome 1953). G. Hofmann, *Concilium Florentinum*, *OrChr* 16.3 (1929); 17.2 (1930); 22.1 (1931). Idem, *Documenta Concilii Florentini de unione orientalium*, 3 vols. (Rome 1935-36).

LIT. D.J. Geanakoplos, "The Council of Florence (1438-39) and the Problem of Union between the Greek and Latin Churches," *ChHist* 24 (1955) 324-46. J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge 1959). -A.P.

**FESTUS**, Latin historian; died Ephesus 3 Jan. 380. The old identification with Rufius Festus Avienius or his son is not valid. Festus is plausibly, though unprovably, equated with Festus of Tridentum in Raetia, governor of Syria and then proconsul of Asia (372-78), a character condemned for his many vices by AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, EUNAPIOS, and LIBANIOS. After several vicissitudes of fortune, he met the poetic fate of dropping dead on the steps of the temple of



Nemesis at Ephesus. Festus's *Breviarium* is a jejune précis of Roman history from the city's foundation to 369, basically a propaganda piece for the intended Persian campaign of VALENS, who may have requested the work as an *aide-mémoire*, or to whom it may have been addressed in hopes of imperial favor. Several MS headings have it addressed to Valentinian instead, perhaps an error, although some speculate that Festus sent the work to both emperors with different dedications. Highly derivative for the most part, his work has some value for the administrative and military history of the Roman east from the late 3rd–4th C.

ED. *The Breviarium of Festus*, ed. J.W. Eadie (London 1967).

LIT. B. Baldwin, "Festus the Historian," *Historia* 27 (1978) 197–217. Den Boer, *Historians* 173–223. M. Peachin, "The Purpose of Festus' *Breviarium*," *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985) 158–61. —B.B.

**FETHIYE CAMII.** See PAMMAKARISTOS, CHURCH OF HAGIA MARIA.

**FEUDALISM**, a term often used in modern Byz. scholarship to characterize a variety of Byz. social, economic, and political institutions and relationships. As in other fields of history, scholars disagree on the term's definition and therefore on whether/when Byz. became a "feudal society," what parts of it were "feudal," and whether the term should be applied to Byz. at all. Some academics, esp. Marxists, maintain that Byz. society can be understood only in a feudal context. These scholars variously consider Byz. to have become "feudal" in the 3rd, 7th, or 10th C., depending on such issues as whether the late Roman COLONI were already serfs and whether the inhabitants of the 10th-C. VILLAGE COMMUNITY were free smallholding PEASANTS or dependents of the state (see DEMOSIARIOS). On the other hand, those who consider feudalism to be the devolution of public (state) power into private hands debate when and to what extent privileges—fiscal (see EXEMPTION), administrative, and judicial—were granted to large landowners and even to towns, while agreeing that the process of devolution reached its fullest extent in the 14th–15th C.

Others see feudalism as primarily a system of hierarchical relationships among members of the ruling class, and, while the Western feudal con-

cepts of fealty, homage, the benefice, and vassalage had little expression in Byz., these scholars debate whether the Byz. ARISTOCRACY ever became a hereditary, "feudal" nobility. Still others consider it misleading to apply the term *feudalism*, so laden with its autochthonous western European connotations, to Byz. Even these scholars, however, find it difficult to ignore the parallels between Western medieval and Byz. institutions (whether borrowed or indigenous to Byz.; see IMMUNITY, LIZIOS, APPANAGE, PRONOIA) and often find it useful to speak, if not of feudalism, then of "feudalizing tendencies" or the "feudalization" of Byz.

LIT. K. Watanabe, "Problèmes de la 'féodalité' byzantine," *Hitotsubashi Journal of Arts and Sciences* 5 (1965) 32–40; 6 (1965) 8–24. Patlagean, *Structures*, pt.III (1975), 1371–96. Kazhdan-Constable, *Byzantium* 6f, 118–21. H. Antoniadis-Bibikou, "Problemata tes pheoudarchias sto Byzantio," *Epistemonike skepse* 1 (1981) 31–41. D. Jacoby, *HC* 6:190–93. —M.B.

**FIBULA** (*περόνη*), a fastener for a cloak, shawl, or overgarment, usually placed on the shoulder of the wearer. Made of bronze, gilt bronze, gold, or silver, it is essentially a securing device, as distinct from a brooch, which is primarily decorative and consists of a hinged pin fastened to a front plate. The *fibula* was made of a single length of wire coiled on itself to produce a spring, while the back was bowed to allow for the bulk of the fabric it held. Its back portion was generally diamond- or lozenge-shaped, or cruciform, but circular *fibulae* appear by the 6th C. Initially they were plain, then repoussé; later versions are of openwork with gilt, gold wire, pendant gems and pearls, and glass paste; eventually they were decorated with cloisonné ENAMEL. Gold *fibulae* with inscriptions were given by rulers as gifts on state occasions down to the late 4th C. Conversely, plain bronze wire *fibulae*, resembling large safety pins, have been found in simple burials. The Byz. version of this fastener is generally the 6th-C. type, with rounded back, varying amounts of gold and gems, and sometimes a pendant cross or Christian inscription. The jeweled *fibula* that Justinian I wears on the right shoulder in the mosaics of S. Vitale, RAVENNA, identifies his imperial status.

Plain *fibulae* of bronze have been found during archaeological excavations in various centers of Greece and Macedonia (e.g., Nea Anchialos, Edessa

[Vodena]). They are dated predominantly to the 6th–8th C. and were often discovered together with BELT FITTINGS. The provenance of these objects is under discussion: while some scholars (e.g., J. Werner, *BZ* 49 [1956] 141f) consider them Bulgarian, Avar, or Slavic and interpret their presence in the Balkans as evidence of barbarian invasions, others insist on their local production.

LIT. J. Heurgon, *RAC* 7:791–800. C. Parkhurst, "The Melvin Gutman Collection of Ancient and Medieval Gold," *AMAM B* 18.2/3 (1961) 40–286. *Age of Spirit.*, no.275. D. Pallas, "Données nouvelles sur quelques boucles et fibules considérées comme avars et slaves et sur Corinthe entre le VIe et le IXe s.," *BBulg* 7 (1981) 295–318. N.M. Beljaev, "Fibula v Vizantii," *SemKond* 3 (1929) 49–114.

—S.D.C., A.K.

**FIDEICOMMISSUM** (*φιδεικόμισσον, τὰ πιστευει καταλιμπανόμενα*). Originally the *fideicommissum* consisted of an informal request of the testator addressed to the HEIRS or other beneficiaries of the deceased's estate. Since no one could bring suit against it, the fulfillment of the *fideicommissum* was dependent upon the honesty of the person of whom the request was made. After the *fideicommissum* became actionable (at the beginning of the Roman imperial period), it was gradually equated with the LEGATON, a process that ended with the full equation of the two under Justinian I (*Cod. Just.* VI 43.2, a.531).

**Fideicommissum in the Post-Justinianic Period.** The practice, if not the term, is common in Byz. Thus, for example, Kale-Maria, widow of Symbarios Pakourianos, bequeathed in 1098–1113 a part of her property to the monastery of Iveron while imposing on the monks certain pious obligations; a special clause (*FGHBulg* 7 [1967] 72.24–31) instructs the executors of her will to sue the monks if they fail to carry out her wishes. Another type of Byz. *fideicommissum* appears in the will of Theodore Kerameas of 1284 (*Lavra* 2, no.75), who commissioned Emp. Michael VIII and his own brother to carry out the construction of the monastery of Christ Pantodamos in Thessalonike; instead of receiving a bequest of property, his brother was promised spiritual wealth, the "riches of God's compassion."

LIT. Kaser, *Privatrecht* 2:549–67 (§§297–300). —A.K.

**FIFTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.** See CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF: Constantinople II.

**FILELFO, FRANCESCO**, Italian humanist, teacher, and translator; born Tolentino, Italy 25 July 1398, died Florence 31 July 1481. Filelfo (*Φιλέλφος*) spent the years 1420–27 in Constantinople as secretary to a Venetian official. He took advantage of this sojourn to study Greek with George CHRYSOKOKKES and with a member of the Chrysoloras family, whose daughter he married. As a result of his studies, he became an ardent philhellene, brought back to Italy MSS of 40 Greek authors, and named one of his sons Xenophon. He taught both Greek and Latin literature in Bologna, Florence, and Milan.

After his return to Italy, Filelfo was active as a translator of ancient Greek authors such as Xenophon (the *Cyropaedia*) and Plutarch. He maintained close relations with both the Italian and Greek émigré scholars of his day, conducting correspondence in Greek and Latin. Of his Greek letters 110 survive, many on literary topics (requests for books, criticism of literary works, discussion of Aristotelian philosophy). His most frequent addressees were Theodore GAZES (18 letters), Bessarion (16), and John ARGYROPOULOS (10). His letters contain many allusions to classical Greek literature and mythology. He was appalled by the Turkish conquest of Constantinople and recognized the consequent threat to Italy. Gazes addressed to Filelfo his treatise on the origins of the Turks. Filelfo also wrote three books of poems in Greek, of which only a few have been published.

ED. E. Legrand, *Cent-dix lettres grecques de François Filelfe* (Paris 1892), with Fr. tr.

LIT. A. Calderini, "Ricerche intorno alla biblioteca e alla cultura greca di Francesco Filelfo," *SttalFCl* 20 (1913) 204–424. —A.M.T.

**FILIOQUE**, Latin word meaning "and from the Son," which in the West was added to the creed of Nicaea-Constantinople at a Spanish council in Toledo in 589. It was meant to affirm that the Holy Spirit proceeded not only "from the Father" but also "from the Son." When Frankish missionaries used the interpolated creed in 9th-C. Bulgaria, direct polemics on the issue began between Latins and Greeks. Patr. PHOTIOS, in an *Encyclical* addressed to the other patriarchs (866), attacked both the interpolation and the doctrine of the "double procession." Eventually, legates of Pope JOHN VIII accepted the decrees of the Photian council of 879–80 in Constantinople (see under



CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF), which stated that "the Creed cannot be subtracted from, added to, altered or distorted in any way . . ." (Mansi 17:516C). Photios composed a lengthy refutation of the "double procession" following his retirement in 886. It is generally believed that the interpolated creed was accepted in Rome in 1014. The interpolation was affirmed as legitimate by the councils of LYONS (1274) and FERRARA-FLORENCE (1438-39), but was rejected in the East.

LIT. M. Jugie, *De processione Spiritus Sancti ex fontibus revelationis et secundum orientales dissidentes* (Rome 1936). R. Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy* (Belmont, Mass., 1975). B. Schultze, "Zum Ursprung des Filioque," *OrChrP* 48 (1982) 5-18. G.C. Berthold, "Maximus the Confessor and the Filioque," *StP* 18.1 (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1985) 113-17. -J.M.

**FIRE** (*ἐμπρησμός, πῦρ*). Fire was an ever-present hazard in the large, densely populated cities of the Byz. world; consequently a metropolis like Constantinople had a squadron of fire fighters (*collegiati*) under the jurisdiction of the eparch of the city in each of its regions. Nevertheless, great conflagrations, begun accidentally or deliberately, still engulfed whole sections of large cities as they spread rapidly along the porticoes and major thoroughfares. Like EARTHQUAKES, fires were interpreted by the Byz. as signs of divine anger; for example, the fire of 1 Sept. 465 was thereafter the object of an annual liturgical commemoration (*Synax.CP* 6.3-9). Major fires in Constantinople occurred in summer 388; 12 July 400; 20 June 404; 25 Oct. 406; 15 Apr. 428; 17 Aug. 433; 448; 1-2 Sept. 465; 475; 498; 509; 510; 6 Nov. 512; 15-17 Jan. 532 (during the Nika Revolt); July 548; 13 May 559; Dec. 560; 12 Oct. 561; Dec. 563; Apr. 583; 603; 10 Aug. 626; Dec. 790; 886/7; spring 912; summer 931; 6 Aug. 1040; after Sept. 1069; before 1194 destroying the northern region of Constantinople (Nik.Chon. 445.29); 25 July 1197; 17 July 1203 (set by the Crusaders); 19-21 Aug. 1203; 12 Apr. 1204; 25 July 1261 (the Greeks burned the Latin quarters); Nov. 1291; 1303; 1308; Aug. 1351; 29 Jan. 1434 (this list compiled after Schneider with slight corrections). Fires outside Constantinople are little known or studied, though the sources mention attacks by enemies who set fire to strongholds, threshing floors, and crops in fields.

The image of fire or flame occupied a signifi-

cant place in theological concepts and in literature: fire was the major means of punishment in hell, and a final conflagration was expected at the end of the world. Metaphorically, the Byz. would speak of the fire of wrath, passion, heresy, persecution, etc. The pagan concept of the divine nature of fire (e.g., the Persian worship of fire) was refuted and ridiculed, but the image of God as fire was retained, as well as the concept of miraculous fire related to angels and saints. The Byz. themselves stressed the ambiguous nature of fire, contrasting material and immaterial (spiritual) fire, divine fire and fire of sin, illuminating and burning fire.

LIT. A.M. Schneider, "Brände in Konstantinopel," *BZ* 41 (1941) 382-89. Lampe, *Lexikon* 1208-11. -B.C.

**FIREARMS.** Portable firearms were unknown in Byz. Cannons were developed in western Europe during the 14th C. and were first used against the Byz., to little effect, by the Turks in their siege of Constantinople in 1422. G. Škrivanić (*Kosovska bitka* [Cetinje 1956] 28-30) asserts that Dubrovnik obtained cannons by the mid-14th C. and that during the battle at Kosovo Polje in 1389 both the Serbs and the Turks used firearms. But while the Turks continued to invest in improved siege guns, the Byz. had neither the materials nor the money to develop their own cannons. Doukas (Douk. 307.20-309.27) and other historians recounting the fall of the city in 1453 (see CONSTANTINOPLE, SIEGE AND FALL OF) tell of the Hungarian gunsmith Urban who first offered his skills to the impecunious Constantine XI Palaiologos before entering the far more remunerative service of the Turks. The cannons he built for Mehmed II the Conqueror, esp. one huge gun capable of firing a stone weighing over 1,000 pounds, were instrumental in demolishing parts of the city walls and blocking the Golden Horn to the ships of Byz. allies, while the few small Byz. guns were badly outweighed and outranged.

LIT. J.R. Partington, *A History of Greek Fire and Gunpowder* (Cambridge 1960) 124-28. Dj. Petrović, "Firearms in the Balkans on the Eve and After the Ottoman Conquest of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, ed. V.J. Parry, M.E. Yapp (London 1975) 164-94. -E.M.

**FIRST ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.** See NICAEA, COUNCILS OF: NICAEA I.

**FISCAL SYSTEM.** Continuing the Roman practice, the state maintained a BUDGET based mainly on agricultural revenues. Indirect taxation, esp. from CUSTOMS (the OCTAVA, then the KOMMERKION), always burdened the circulation and sale of merchandise. On the contrary, CITY TAXES disappeared after the 7th C.

Payment of taxes has always been seen as a main and inevitable obligation of the population, but devolution of fiscal revenue was also practiced to varying degrees: tax exemptions allowed landowners to keep for their own profit at least part of the fiscal revenues; and fiscal revenues could be the object of outright grants to individuals (*logisima*), often as a compensation for services provided to the state (esp. in the PRONOIA system). Such practices had important social consequences.

**First Period (4th to 7th C.).** The 3rd-C. crisis and Diocletian's reforms resulted in a fiscal system based mainly on contributions in kind, first of all on the ANNONA, the burden of which was distributed to taxpayers following the system of CAPITATIO-JUGATIO. Fiscal revenue from land was stabilized for periods of time according to the INDICTIO and was eventually increased (or restored in case of abandoned lands) by the EPIBOLE. Following the establishment by Constantine I of a stable monetary system based on gold, the fiscal services, eager to collect precious metal, applied increasingly the principle of COMMUTATION, in spite of the injustices that this might entail, and ended by officially transforming the land tax into a contribution in gold (CHRYSOTELEIA). In 518, public finances were healthy, with attested reserves of 320,000 pounds of gold. Fiscal income was complemented by various SECONDARY TAXES and services.

Until the 7th C. at least, the empire's fiscal services were attached to the PRAETORIAN PREFECT (and, secondarily, to the COMES SACRARUM LARGITIONUM) and functioned through provincial governors and various local authorities (or the latifundary landowners). SYNETHETAI were the main remuneration of TAX COLLECTORS.

**Second Period (8th to 12th C.).** The new fiscal system is essentially known from the 9th C. onward, thanks esp. to some treatises on TAXATION. It was based on the idea that each fiscal unit, be it an individual (*prosopon*, owning one or more PROASTEIA), or a village (CHORION, a community of small landowners with some communal prop-

erties), was expected to produce a stable fiscal revenue each year, following the principle of fiscal solidarity among its members. Until a TAX ALLEVIATION was granted, neighbors were responsible for the tax of abandoned lots; and if, after alleviation, they agreed to take over such a lot, they were required to pay deferred taxes (OPISTHOTELEIA) as if they had already been exploiting it. Solidarity in payment of taxes was brought beyond the limits of the fiscal unit by Basil II with the ALLELENGYON.

The main tax, the KANON, was paid on land (4.166 percent *ad valorem*; but this "fiscal" value could differ from the real one—Schilbach, *Met. Quellen* 59f) and its amount was established according to the *epibole* for each fiscal unit described in the CADASTER; it was increased by the PARAKOLOUTHEMATA and had to be paid mostly in gold coins (CHARAGMA). To these were added the HEARTH TAX and many secondary taxes, CORVÉES, and services (in kind or in money). Some categories of land (those submitted to the STRATEIA or the DROMOS) were in principle exempt from secondary taxes, as were those of lay or ecclesiastic landowners that had received a privilege from the emperor (very seldom was the *kanon* included in such exemptions). Various TITHES were collected from state-owned lands.

Fiscal services were under the authority of the *logothetes* of the GENIKON, whose representatives operated in the provinces under the supervision of the STRATEGOI: ANAGRAPHEIS conducted the census, EPOPTAI revised the cadaster, EXISOTAI verified and redistributed the fiscal burden of the contributors, and DIOIKETAI collected the taxes. Military obligations related to the *strateia* were controlled by the LOGOTHETES TOU STRATIOFIKOU, postal obligations by the LOGOTHETES TOU DROMOU. The PROTONOTARIOS of the theme was in charge of provincial finances and levying most of the secondary taxes and corvées. In the 10th-11th C. provincial judges also collected taxes.

**Third Period (12th to 15th C.).** The fiscal system, although retaining its main characteristics, changed considerably by adapting to new realities: the development of large landed property, social changes in the countryside (peasants were now increasingly PAROIKOI, often of the state), enhanced by the development of the *pronoia* system. The tax collector was now the PRAKTOR of a given province, most often a tax farmer. The census,



carried out by the APOGRAPHEUS (whose PRAKTIKA replaced the systematic cadaster), served as a basis for calculating the fiscal revenues that would be collected by the state (or by landowners who were granted tax exemptions) or would be distributed to *pronoia* holders. Land was taxed at a flat rate (50 modioi: 1 hyperpyron) and this TELOS was distinguished from the tax on the *paroikoi* (ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ), which was calculated according to principles that are not yet clear. The secondary taxes, smaller in number but not necessarily lighter, presented substantial regional variations (Lefort, "Fiscalité" 315–54).

Between 1404 and 1420, the Byz. administration, established in the Chalkidike after 20 years of Ottoman domination, perpetuated the pre-existing fiscal system with some Islamic taxes—the *harac* (land tax), the *usr* (tithe), the *kephalalikion* (capitation)—and with very few secondary taxes and services (N. Oikonomides, *SüdostF* 45 [1986] 1–24). (See also TAXATION.)

LIT. Jones, *IRE* 411–69. Karayannopoulos, *Finanzwesen*. Dölger, *Beiträge*. Svoronos, *Cadastre*. Schilbach, *Metrologie* 248–57. Litavrin, *VizObščestvo* 196–236. *Lavra* 4:153–73. N. Oikonomides, "De l'impôt de distribution à l'impôt de quotité. A propos du premier cadastre byzantin (7<sup>e</sup>–9<sup>e</sup> siècle)," *ZRVI* 26 (1987) 9–19. K. Chvostova, "Sud'by pariki i osobennosti nalogoobloženija parikov v Vizantii XIV v.," *VizVrem* 39 (1978) 54–75. —N.O.

**FISH BOOK.** See OPSAROLOGOS.

**FISHING** (ἀλεία). Peasants living in villages along the seacoast, or near a river, marsh, or pond, engaged in fishing to secure an important source of protein in their DIET. The Great Lavra on Mt. Athos possessed, among its AUTOURGIA, two canals for fishing, a fishing boat (*karabion*), and 60 fishponds (VIVARIA), while in the list of its *paroikoi* 56 boats and 374 *vivaria* are mentioned (Svoronos in *Lavra* 4:163); the peasants paid a rent (*haleia*) for the right to fish. Another rent for fishing was called *halieutike tritomoiria* or *tetramoiria* (third or fourth part). In cities located on the coast there were teams of fishermen, each with a headman (*proteuon*), like the group of fishermen in Chalcedon whose catch was disappointing until Loukas the Stylite blessed their nets and made them promise to give him a tithe, that is, every tenth fish; the other fish were to be sold (Delehaye,

*Saints stylites* 212f). Smoked fish and caviar were brought to Constantinople from the Azov Sea. Commercial fishing from a small fleet of boats in a sea inhabited by a variety of species illustrates the homily of John of Damascus on the Nativity in the 11th-C. Menologion from Athos, Esphigmenou 14 (*Treasures* 2, fig.348).

The images of fish and angler had an honorific place in the Byz. system of metaphors. Fish was the symbol of Christ himself (ΙΧΘΥΣ = Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Ὑιὸς Σωτήρ), and it was common to send fish to friends as a valuable present; "fishers of men" was an epithet of the apostles.

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 5:331–43. C.C. Giurescu, *Istoria pescuitului și a pisciculturii în România*, vol. 1 (Bucharest 1964) 53–86. E. Trapp, "Die gesetzlichen Bestimmungen über die Errichtung einer Epoche," *ByzF* 1 (1966) 329–33. F. Tinnefeld, "Zur kulinarischen Qualität byzantinischer Speisefische," in *Studies in the Mediterranean World Past and Present*, vol. 11 (Tokyo 1988) 155–76.

—J.W.N., A.K., A.C.

**FISHMONGER** (ἰχθυοπράτης). The term *ichthyoprates* (or *ichthyopoles*) existed in Roman Egypt (Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* 1:705) where the profession seems to have been distinct from that of fisherman or *halieus* (ibid. 1:56) and that of the vendor of salted and smoked fish or *taricheutes* (the feminine form *tarichopratisa* is attested in a 6th-C. papyrus; ibid. 2:578f). Fishermen in Constantinople could sell their catch themselves, like the man described in the vita of Andrew *en Krisei* (AASS, Oct. 8:141B) who operated in the Forum Tauri and was armed with an ax "that is used by the men of his profession." The *Book of the Eparch*, however, strictly distinguished between fishermen and *ichthyopratai*: the latter would buy the catch at the seashore and on the SKALAI and sell it in special *kamarai*, vaulted shops, in the fish market, under the control of *prostatai*—either the eparch's officials or the guild's elders. Fishmongers were prohibited from dealing in salted and smoked fish (the privilege of the *saldamarioi* or GROCERS); their profit was set at one miliaresion per nomisma (about 8 percent) or 2 folleis per nomisma—about 1.5 percent (*Bk. of Eparch* 17:1 and 3)—a contradiction that is hard to explain. John IZETZES (ep.81.16–82.2) relates that fishmongers were buying 12 fish for a copper coin on the seashore and selling 10 fish for the same coin on the market, thus making

16.6 percent profit. The annual income of the fisc from the trade in fish was calculated in the 14th C. at 10,000 hyperpers (Greg. 1:428.19–20).

LIT. Stöckle, *Zünfte* 45–47. *Bk. of Eparch* 231–36. Litavrin, *VizObščestvo* 144f. L. Balletto, "Il commercio del pesce nel Mar Nero sulla fine del Duecento," *Critica storica* 13 (1976) 390–407. Oikonomides, *Hommes d'affaires* 99, n.178. —A.K.

**FIVE MARTYRS OF SEBASTEIA**, Eustratios and his companions, Auxentios, Eugenios, Mardarios, and Orestes, legendary martyrs under Diocletian, executed in Sebasteia, Armenia; feastday 13 Dec. According to the legend, Eustratios Kyriskes, an officer (*skrinarios*) in the army of the *doux* Lysias, proclaimed himself a Christian and was condemned together with the priest Auxentios. Their courage inspired many others to accept martyrdom. Before death they were severely tortured: Eustratios had to wear shoes with sharp nails inside; Mardarios was hanged upside down; Eugenios's tongue and hands were cut off. When Auxentios was beheaded, a miracle occurred: his head disappeared, later to be found at the top of a tree. The collection of SYMEON METAPHRASTES includes the *passio*, poor in information; it mentions many ancient mythological personages and authors such as Hesiod, Aeschylus, Plato, and Aristotle. According to the LIBER PONTIFICALIS, the martyrs' relics were transferred to Rome under Pope Hadrian I (772–95), but Arauraka in Armenia, where they were buried, remained a cult center until the 11th C. NIKETAS DAVID PAPHLAGON and Michael of Stoudios wrote Greek eulogies of the martyrs. Armenian, Latin, and Spanish versions of the *passio* also exist.

**Representation in Art.** The Five Martyrs of Sebasteia, the "Holy Five," as they were often called, were an extremely popular group, included in many monumental church programs, on icons, and in MSS (e.g., the THEODORE PSALTER, fol.158r). Their portraits are well established by the 11th C.: Eustratios as a dark-bearded official wearing a special chlamys fastened at the front with several clasps and a white *loros* or scarf around his neck; Auxentios as an old man in court costume; Eugenios, a younger man also in court costume; Mardarios, wearing a red felt hat; and Orestes, a young beardless soldier wearing a cross around his neck. The MENOLOGION OF BASIL II

(p.241) illustrates their diverse martyrdoms as do some MSS of the *menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes; one MS in Turin, which contains nothing but the metaphrastic vita of these saints, is illustrated with a considerable number of miniatures scattered through the text. A painted TEMPLON beam depicting 11 posthumous miracles of Eustratios has been preserved at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; no textual source for the miracles has been found (Soteriou, *Eikones*, no.113).

SOURCE. PG 116:468–505.

LIT. BHG 646–646c. K. Weitzmann, "Illustrations to the Lives of the Five Martyrs of Sebaste," *DOP* 33 (1979) 95–112. Mouriki, *Nea Moni* 1:143–48. Th. Chatzidakis-Bacharas, *Les peintures murales de Hosios Loukas* (Athens 1982) 74–81. F. Halkin, "L'épilogue d'Eusèbe de Sebaste à la Passion de S. Eustrate et de ses compagnons," *AB* 88 (1970) 279–83. J. Boberg, *LCI* 6:200f. —A.K., N.P.S.

**FLABELLUM.** See RHIPIDION.

**FLAG.** See BATTLE STANDARD AND FLAG.

**FLAVIAN** (Φλαβιανός), bishop of Constantinople (July 446—between 8 and 11 Aug. 449); died Lydian Hypaera Aug. 449 or Feb. 450. Elected as successor of PROKLOS, Flavian immediately entered into a conflict with the court: the eunuch Chrysaphios, favorite of Theodosios II, reprimanded Flavian for not sending presents of gold to the emperor on the occasion of his election, but the bishop refused to yield (Theoph. 98.11–19). Then, in 448, with Pope LEO I's support, Flavian dismissed Bassianos, the popular bishop of Ephesus, whose election had been approved by Theodosios II and Proklos. A crisis erupted when in 448 Flavian condemned and deposed the Monophysite archimandrite EUTYCHES, a protégé of Chrysaphios. Following an appeal by Eutyches, Theodosios II convoked the "Robber" Council of EPHESUS (449), which deposed Flavian. The mood in Ephesus was evidently hostile to Flavian; even its bishop Stephen voted for Flavian's condemnation. Flavian was banished and probably died en route to exile, even though shortly afterward the legend arose that he had been murdered by his enemies. Emp. Marcian ordered that Flavian's remains be brought to Constantinople and buried



in the Church of the Holy Apostles. Emp. Leo I and the Council of Chalcedon praised Flavian in 451 as a victim of the Monophysites.

ED. PL 54:724-28, 731-36.

SOURCE. *S. Leonis Magni tomus ad Flavianum episc. Constantinopolitanum*, ed. C. Silva-Tarouca (Rome 1932).

LIT. *RegPatr*, fasc. 1, nos. 94-110. H. Chadwick, "The Exile and Death of Flavian of Constantinople," *JThSt* n.s. 6 (1955) 17-34. P. Batiffol, "L'affaire de Bassianos d'Éphèse (444-448)," *EO* 23 (1924) 385-94. J. Liébaert, *DGHE* 17 (1971) 390-96. —A.K.

**FLAVIANUS**, a Roman senatorial family closely related to and ideologically connected with that of SYMMACHUS. Two Flaviani played a signal role under Theodosios I. Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (ca.334-94) belonged to the intellectual elite of Rome and was known as a translator, a character in Macrobius's *Saturnalia*, and a historian: his *Annales*, which extended to 366, served as the main source for AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS. He owned estates in Apulia and Sicily. A dogged supporter of paganism, he favored the Donatists in 377, while serving as *vicarius* of Africa, and was dismissed by Gratian; Theodosios, however, restored him to favor, appointing him quaestor in 389 and then praetorian prefect for Illyricum and Italy. His son, Nicomachus Flavianus junior, obtained Theodosios's favor even earlier, and served in 382/3 as proconsul of Asia. Dismissed for flogging a *decurion*, he fled home, escaping the emperor's wrath. Both father and son joined the insurrection of EUGENIUS; after their defeat, the father committed suicide and the son found asylum in a church. He obtained Theodosios's pardon by accepting Christianity and promising to return the salary he and his father were paid during Eugenius's usurpation. He served in Italy and Africa (until 432) and was three times urban prefect. Their relation to other Flaviani is not specified in the sources.

LIT. O. Seeck, *RE* 6 (1909) 2505-13. *PLRE* 1:343-49. J.-P. Callu, "Les préfetures de Nicomaque Flavien," in *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne offerts à William Seston* (Paris 1974) 73-80. Matthews, *Aristocracies* 231-47. —A.K.

**FLIGHT INTO EGYPT**. The Holy Family's flight to escape Herod's massacre of the young children (Mt 2:13-15) belongs to the cycle of Christ's INFANCY. It appears often in 4th- through 6th-C. art, where, cast as an imperial ADVENTUS, it as-

sumes triumphal significance: Mary and Christ ride a donkey led by a youth or angel toward a city and the personification of Egypt; Joseph follows. Some versions depict palms, recalling Christ's similarly triumphal ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM (see also PALM SUNDAY) and a domed city, perhaps Heliopolis, where—according to pseudo-Matthew and *The Arabian Gospel of the Childhood of Christ*—the idols fell when Christ arrived. The *adventus* composition recurs in the 10th C. at GÖREME, with the youth labeled JAMES. Generally, however, the triumphal element dwindles, and later versions emphasize Christ's humanity. The personification appears only sporadically, Joseph takes the lead (see FRIEZE GOSPELS), and, in certain 12th-C. compositions, he carries Christ on his back (Cappella Palatina at PALERMO). Palaiologan painters relished this detail, but also depicted the triumphal scene of the falling idols (CHORA).

LIT. G. Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, vol. 1 (London 1971-72) 117-20. —A.W.C.

**FLOOD, THE** (*κατακλυσμός*). According to the CHRONICON PASCHALE (42.12-16), the inundation of the world (Gen 6-8) completed the period of "barbarism" that encompassed the ten generations from ADAM to NOAH when men had no ruler and everyone lived in accordance with his own law. GEORGE THE SYNKELLOS states (15.24-27) that before the flood men occupied a small area between Paradise and the ocean, but thereafter they started settling all over the earth. Thus the flood was the starting point for the development of individual "nations."

The flood posed a serious problem for exegetes: how to reconcile the extermination of all mankind (except for Noah and his family) with the idea of divine mercy. As John Chrysostom put it (PG 55:448.14-15), the flood allows us to contemplate the balance between God's mercy and God's justice. The flood was caused by men's sins that needed to be punished, but, on the other hand, those who were destroyed have been given time to repent; the mercy of God was symbolized by the olive branch. Previously Origen had rejected other explanations of the flood, such as it being an element of the cosmic cycle or representing a change in the divine plan. The flood was also construed as the PREFIGURATION (*typos*) of baptism.

The vivid narrative of the Flood and NOAH'S ARK (Gen 7:17-8:14) was widely illustrated in the great repositories of GENESIS iconography, such as the Cotton Genesis and Vienna Genesis (Weitzmann, *Late Ant. Ill.*, pl.23) but was rare in monumental art.

LIT. H. Hohl, *ICI* 4:161-3. V. Ficchi Nicolai, *DPAC* 1:957. R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Archeologia e cultura*<sup>2</sup> (Rome 1979) 328-43. J.P. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden 1968). —A.K., J.H.L.

**FLOOR MOSAIC** (*ψηφοδέτημα, λιθόστρωτον*), floor covering composed of tesserae, cube-shaped pieces of stone or glass, set into mortar in geometric and/or figural designs. The craft was widespread in the Roman Empire and continued uninterrupted into late antiquity; it flourished from the 4th to the 6th C. but was apparently not practiced in Byz. after the 7th. Late Antique floor mosaics are almost exclusively *opus tessellatum*, i.e., composed of uniform tesserae of variously colored stone—primarily marble and limestone—sometimes supplemented with terra-cotta and/or glass tesserae. Their substructures comprise three layers of progressively finer and thinner lime mortar with ground brick or *pozzuolana*: the *rudus* (a layer of coarse mortar poured over packed stones), the *nucleus*, and the setting bed.

Floor mosaic was used widely in public buildings and luxurious residences where it provided a decorative, durable, and waterproof surface; it was apparently less prestigious than OPUS SECTILE. Figures and ornament of floor mosaics generally follow the style of MONUMENTAL PAINTING. Scholars have identified criteria of composition and style unique to floor mosaics, but the inherently conservative nature of the craft and variations according to region and quality make dating by style uncertain. Not only ORNAMENT, but subject matter and style varied according to region; until the early 4th C., eastern Mediterranean mosaics displayed illusionistic mythological scenes in prominent frames placed in the center of the floor, in contrast to the polychrome depictions of hunts and other subjects from the amphitheater on North African mosaics (see NORTH AFRICA, MONUMENTS OF) or the black-and-white style typical of Rome and Ostia.

In some regions these practices continued during the early 4th C.; elsewhere style and/or subject

matter changed significantly. The eastern Mediterranean was particularly conservative. Illusionistic mythological scenes still dominated pavements at ANTIOCH and Shahba-Philippopolis. In the Balkans, some mosaics (e.g., at SIRMUM) show influence from western Europe, others from the East. Polychrome hunting and marine mosaics with two-dimensional figures distributed across the entire floor, as in Roman North Africa, then became popular in other regions, including Italy. The largest ensemble of early 4th-C. mosaics, at PIAZZA ARMERINA, included subjects—hunts, marine scenes, *putti* harvesting grapes—close to contemporary floors in CARTHAGE. At GAMZIGRAD in eastern Serbia, Emp. Galerius decorated his palace with hunting mosaics. Such subjects were rare in the 4th-C. eastern Mediterranean; those in the "Constantinian Villa" at Antioch are exceptional. After the edicts of toleration issued in ca.311-13 (see EDICT OF MILAN) monumental Christian buildings, as at AQUILEIA, provided new settings for floor mosaics. Christian subjects were combined with preexisting decorative and figural elements. SYNAGOGUES were also decorated with floor mosaic, sometimes figural, e.g., the zodiac at Hammath Tiberias.

By the end of the 4th C., most floor mosaics were ecclesiastical. At this time a vogue for strictly geometric floor mosaics—in churches and secular buildings alike—dominated the eastern Mediterranean, e.g., at Antioch (Kausiye Church), APAMEIA, Epidauros, SALONA. They extended as far west as northern Italy, while figural mosaics remained popular in North Africa and Italy.

Most 5th-C. floor mosaics in the eastern Mediterranean, particularly in Syria and Palestine, had figures executed in a two-dimensional style, contained in a geometric framework or regularly distributed across a white ground. The same themes dominated in secular and religious contexts. Depictions of animals alone or in rustic scenes and hunts, rare in the East earlier, now became extremely popular. Usually the subject matter remains secular, e.g., at Huarte (Basilica of Photios), Antioch (Martyrion of Seleukeia), Tabgha (Nilotic scenes in HEPTAPEGON). Sometimes biblical content was introduced: Adam appeared among the animals at Huarte (Michaelion), NOAH'S ARK was depicted at Mopsuestia, the "Peaceable Kingdom" was a popular theme in CILICIA, e.g., Karlik. Biblical narrative scenes like



the Samson cycle at Mopsuestia are rare in floor mosaics, evidently deemed inappropriate for them. In an edict of 427, Theodosios II forbade placing the sign of Christ on pavements (*Cod. Just.* I. 8).

In the Balkans, geometric mosaics remained the norm well into the 5th C. When figures reappeared, they were less varied than in Syria. Figure carpets with birds and vessels and the FOUNTAIN OF LIFE flanked by deer or peacocks were popular. Geometric floors with donor inscriptions remained common into the 6th C. in Dalmatia and northern Italy. Christian mosaics of North Africa were restrained, tomb mosaics with symbolic motifs being typical.

In the 6th C. floor mosaics continued to flourish in Phoenicia and Palestine, but fewer were laid in Syria than in the 5th. Elements of the natural world, including personifications of SEASONS and MONTHS, remained the most common subjects. Frequently these subjects were incorporated into ORNAMENT. The medallion style, characterized by a decorative framework of repeated circles sometimes outlined by stylized vine RINCEAUX, was particularly prominent, as at Kabr Hiram. Mosaics of the period of Justinian I reflect the concept of the church building as MICROCOSM, with the terrestrial world depicted on the floor, e.g., GERASA, Church of St. John, MADABA MOSAIC MAP. At Mt. NEBO, compositions symbolic of paradise were placed in sanctuaries. Many synagogues received floor mosaics representing ceremonial utensils and images of the zodiac (Beth Alpha) or animals in vine scrolls (as at Nirim). Depictions of the natural world penetrated into the Balkans by the late 5th–6th C. Personifications of the months appear at Tegea and again at Argos. Elaborate representations of terrestrial creation are seen at Herakleia Lynkestis and the Dometius Basilica at NIKOPOLIS.

In the peristyle of the GREAT PALACE in Constantinople, illusionistic depictions of animals, circus scenes, and vignettes from nature were scattered across a white ground. Although this mosaic somewhat resembles the 5th-C. mosaics of northern Syria, available archaeological evidence suggests a 6th- or 7th-C. date. Seventh-century floor mosaics are rare in the provinces. Only a few crude examples, such as the scenes of everyday life from Deir el-Adas in Syria, can be dated so late. The craft declined together with the provincial cities, although it was briefly revived outside Byz., in Umayyad mosques and desert palaces in Syria and Palestine in the 8th C.

LIT. E. Kitzinger, "Stylistic Developments in Pavement Mosaics in the Greek East from the Age of Constantine to the Age of Justinian," *La mosaïque gréco-romaine*, vol. 1 (Paris 1965) 341–51. D. Levi, *Antioch Mosaic Pavements* (Princeton 1947). K. Dunbabin, *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa* (Oxford 1978). J. Balty, *Mosaïques antiques de Syrie* (Brussels 1977). Maguire, *Earth and Ocean*. J.-P. Caillet, "Les dédicaces privées de pavements de mosaïque à la fin de l'Antiquité," *AAPA* 2 (1987) 15–38. —R.E.K.

**FLOORS.** The Greek word *patos* (πάτος) designated both a story of a building ("second *patos*"—*Lavra* 3, no.154.5–6; "fourth *patos*"—*Koutloun.*, no.15.93) and "floor" in the usual sense (*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no.52.170). Ordinary houses had floors made of pounded earth (they were called "without floors," *apatotos*—*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no.52.165), wooden boards (*xylopatos*—*MM* 3:56.18, or *sani-dopatos*—*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no.52.168), or might even be paved with marble (*marmaropatos*—*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no.50.103, or *patos dia marmaron*—*MM* 3:55.28–29). Palaces, mansions, and churches often had OPUS SECTILE or mosaic floors (see FLOOR MOSAIC). Archaeological data testify to the preservation of ancient techniques of flooring (A.G. McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces in the Roman World* [Southampton 1975] 198f); furthermore, ancient materials were frequently reused for floor renovation (Ch. Bouras, *DChAE*<sup>4</sup> 11 [1982–83] 10f). Mosaic floors were laid on a layer of mortar, which in turn was set on a bed of sand or of crushed marble and small pebbles (A.L. Jakobson, *Rannesrednevekovyj Chersones* [Moscow-Leningrad 1959] 222).

A law of 427 (*Cod. Just.* I 8.1) and canon 73 of the Council in Trullo prohibited depicting signs of the CROSS on the floor lest they be stepped on; the law of 427 was included in the *Basilika* (*Basil.* 1.1.6). Balsamon, commenting on these decisions, distinguished between those who depicted the cross on the floor due to their simplicity and excessive piety and those who did it consciously to show their disrespect for the cross (Rhalls-Potles, *Syn-tagma* 2:475.28–33).

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 4:278f, 299. T.K. Kirova, "Il problema della casa bizantina," *FelRav* 102 (1971) 299. —A.K.

**FLORENCE** (Φλωρεντία), city in Tuscany. In the late Roman period the city's territory decreased significantly, though the legend that Florence was destroyed by Totila and rebuilt by Charlemagne strongly exaggerates the events. S. Reparata (over

60 m long) is one of the larger churches built in Italian urban centers in late antiquity, and as such is good evidence for local patronage of ecclesiastical construction. The site of the Roman forum continued to be used in medieval times as a market. Local tradition links the establishment of Christianity in Florence with Eastern influence; A. Amore (in *Bibl. Sanct.* 9 [1967] 494) believes that in 6th-C. Florence a chapel of St. MENAS, housing his relics, spurred the development of the local cult of St. Miniatus.

In 1094 Pope Urban II visited Florence, Pisa, and Pistoia calling for participation in the First Crusade, but Florence remained aloof. Later some of the city's high-ranking clergymen participated in the Crusades: Guido of Florence, the cardinal-priest of San Chrysogono, was the pope's legate to the Second Crusade and contributed to the reconciliation between the Byz. and the Westerners; at the beginning of the 13th C. Walter of Florence was bishop of Acre. In the 14th C. the Florentines became more active in the East even though Florence's role was less sophisticated than that of Venice, Genoa, or Pisa: bankers from Florence established themselves at CHLEMOUTSI; the Florentine family of ACCIAJUOLI became major landowners in the Peloponnesos but retained ties with Florence (they were involved in constructing a monastery in Certosa near Florence); the 14th-C. Florentine merchant Francesco PEGOLOTTI demonstrated interest in and knowledge of trade with Constantinople; and the names of Florentines trading with "Turkey" are recorded in Genoese archives (e.g., M. Balard, *Gênes et l'Outre-Mer*, vol. 1 [Paris–The Hague 1973] no.257, a.1289). In the 15th C. Florentines tried to receive trade privileges in Constantinople; they were granted a chrysobull in 1439. The *despotes* of Mistra sent envoys to Florence in 1446 and 1450.

The Florentines participated in preparations for the Council of FERRARA-FLORENCE in the mid-15th C.; they sent a ship to Constantinople to bring some Greeks to Italy (Syropoulos, *Mémoires* 198.5) and were active in persuading the delegates to leave Ferrara, which was ravaged by plague, and to move to Pisa or another city in Florentine territory; finally the council was transferred to Florence at the beginning of 1439. In the 15th C. Florentine humanists had contacts with Byz. scholars such as PLETHON. After the fall of Constantinople Florence provided refuge for some Greek intellectuals: thus Demetrios Chalkokon-

dyles (a relative of Laonikos Chalkokondyles) became a professor of Greek language in Florence in 1475; a large collection of Greek manuscripts was assembled in the city.

LIT. R. Davidsohn, *Geschichte von Florenz*, vols. 1–4 (Berlin 1896–1927). A. Panella, *Storia di Firenze* (Florence 1984). W. Heyd, *Geschichte des Levantehandels im Mittelalter*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart 1879; rp. Hildesheim 1984) 298–302. G. Morozzi et al., *S. Reparata, l'antica cattedrale fiorentina* (Florence 1974). —A.K., R.B.H.

**FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.** See FERRARA-FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.

**FLORILEGIUM** (Lat., lit. "collection of flowers"), a Western medieval term conventionally applied to a Byz. genre of excerpts from earlier authors collected with an explicit purpose. The term is used esp. for theological anthologies, in contrast to predominantly secular collections of GNOMAI or *gnomologia*. A *florilegium* of quotations from commentators on the Bible, strung together and attached to a biblical text, is called a CATENA; one consisting of secular verse is termed an ANTHOLOGY; short *florilegia*, composed of groups of approximately 100 sentences on either religious or secular matters, are known as "centuries."

Richard (*infra*) distinguishes between dogmatic and spiritual *florilegia*. Up to the end of the 4th C., the former were rare, an exception being the PHILOKALIA compiled by Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzos from Origen's writings. They became more common during the 5th-C. Christological disputes and during the Monothelete and Iconoclast controversies. A later example is the *Panoplia Dogmatike* of Euthymios ZIGABENOS.

Spiritual *florilegia* with a moral and ascetic emphasis appear from the 8th C. onward. Richard divides them into three categories. The first includes those based on the SACRA PARALLELA (attributed to John of Damascus) and related texts. The second includes a group of sacro-profane *florilegia* beginning with the *Loci Communes* (or *Capita Theologica*), attributed to MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, but compiled in the 10th C. They flourished during the period of so-called ENCYCLOPEDIA (end of 9th to 10th C.) and in the 11th C. (MELISSA). Based on the *Sacra Parallela* and, in their profane part, on STOBAIOS, they were directed toward an educated public of both clergy and laity. The third category includes monastic



*florilegia*, of which the first example is attributed to ANASTASIOS OF SINAI (the *Erotapokriseis*). They flourished in the 11th C. and later; their authors included NIKON OF THE BLACK MOUNTAIN and JOHN IV OXETTES of Antioch. Although *florilegia* usually contained *sententiae* of various church fathers, collections from a single author (e.g., Basil the Great) are known (J.F. Kindstrand, *Eranos* 83 [1985] 113–24).

LIT. Richard, *Opera minora*, vol. 1, pts. 1–5. P. Odorico, "Il 'Corpus Parisinum' e la fase costitutiva dei florilegi sacro-profani," *SBNG* 417–29. J. Sonderkamp, "Zur Textgeschichte des 'Maximos'-Florilegs," *JÖB* 26 (1977) 231–45. H. Chadwick, *RAC* 7 (1969) 1131–60. —E.M.J., A.K.

**FLORIS AND BLANCHEFLOR.** See PHLORIOS AND PLATZIA-PHLORA.

**FOEDERATI** (φοιδερᾶτοι, from Lat. *foedus*, "treaty"), in Roman law a term for the barbarian tribes who were allies of the empire. In the 4th C. the term was applied to those barbarian groups that—like the Visigoths in 332—were settled on the territory of the Roman Empire on the condition of providing military service (E. Chrysos, *Dacoromania* 1 [1973] 52–64). The term was transferred to elite (mainly mounted) troops recruited primarily from various barbarian tribes. There has been some confusion over the date of this change. C. Benjamin (*infra*), referring to Malal. 364.12–13, spoke of a certain Areobindus, *comes* of *foederati* in the reign of Theodosios I, although he questioned the veracity of this evidence and himself placed the beginning of the institution of the "new *foederati*" in the reign of Honorius; Malalas, however, made Areobindus a contemporary of Theodosios II, not Theodosios I.

The 5th-C. historian Olympiodoros of Thebes (fr.7—*FHG* 4:9.6–10) states that the terms *BOUKELLARIOI* and *foederati* appeared under Honorius, but his evidence may be anachronistic. They are better known from the sources of the 6th C. Prokopios (*Wars* 3:11.3) stresses the further change in the status of the *foederati*: while previously only barbarians were enlisted as *foederati*, in his day anyone could join their ranks.

LIT. G. Wirth, "Zur Frage der foederierten Staaten in der späteren Römischen Kaiserzeit," *Historia* 16 (1967) 231–51. M. Cesa, "Überlegungen zur Föderatenfrage," *Mittel-*

*lungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 92 (1984) 307–16. J. Maspero, "Phoederatoi et Stratiotai dans l'armée byzantine au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle," *BZ* 21 (1912) 97–109. C. Benjamin, *De Iustiniani imperatoris aetate quaestiones militares* (Berlin 1892) 4–18. J.L. Teall, "The Barbarians in Justinian's Armies," *Speculum* 40 (1965) 294–322. —A.K.

**FOLIO** (from Lat. *folium*, Gr. φύλλον, "leaf"), leaf of a QUIRE, consisting of one half of a folded sheet (*bifolium* or *unio*) of parchment or paper. In Byz. MSS only the front of the leaf (i.e., the right-hand page, or recto, as opposed to the reverse side, or verso) is numbered, if there is any numeration at all (most numeration of folios has been added later by owners or librarians). Thus, in modern citations of MSS, folio numbers are qualified by the addition of "recto" or "verso" (abbreviated r and v), e.g., fol.31r or 31v. Normally eight folios (*folia*), or four sheets, constitute a quire.

—A.M.T., R.B.

**FOLLIS** (φόλλις), a Latin word originally meaning a purse and applied to bags of COINS of any metal of determined value. This remained its meaning until the end of the 4th C. The bishop-metrologist EPIPHANIOS of Salamis defines it as a bag of 125 silver pieces. The description of the largest bronze coin of the Tetrarchy as a follis is an anachronism. (It was called a NUMMUS.) With the reintroduction of heavy copper denominations at the end of the 5th C. the term was applied to the heaviest of these, the 40-nummus piece bearing the mark of value M (=40). This remained the normal meaning of the word until the end of the 11th C., the notional value of folles being 1/24th of a MILIARESION and 1/288th of a SOLIDUS, though it is not likely that these ratios can have been sustained in the 7th–8th C., when the follis's weight fell from the approximately 16 g of the early 6th C. to not much over 4 g. The follis was sometimes called an obol, mainly in literary sources but also in, for example, the *Book of the Eparch*. After Alexios I's coinage reform of 1092, the follis was replaced as a coin by the smaller TETARTERON and as a unit of account displaced by the KERATION, so the word gradually disappeared from use. Its Italian equivalent *foliaro* (from *follis aeris* "copper follis"), used at Dubrovnik and elsewhere for locally minted copper coins, was applied by BADOER and other foreign merchants to the smallest copper coin of 15th-C. Con-

stantinople, but the Greek name for these is unknown.

LIT. *DOC* 2:9, 22–32, 3:14f. 68–72. —Ph.G.

**FONDACO.** See PHOUNDAX.

**FONT, BAPTISMAL** (κολυμβήθρα, βαπτιστήριον, φωτιστήριον), a built or stone-carved basin in a special annex of the narthex or atrium of a church or an autonomous BAPTISTERY. Until about the 7th C., a large font, set deep into the baptistery floor, was mainly intended for the BAPTISM of adults; this could be square, rectangular, circular, hexagonal, octagonal, cross-shaped, four-lobed, or multi-lobed in plan. Later, however, smaller fonts, carved in marble or cast in bronze and usually chalice-shaped, were used for the baptism of children only. At Hosios Loukas the font is decorated with lion masks (R.W. Schultz, S.H. Barnsley, *The Monastery of Saint Luke* [London 1901] 32). Other important examples are the roughly octagonal font at the monastery of Hosios Meletios (*ABME* 5 [1939–40] 103, fig.51) and a round one from the Church of the Holy Apostles in the Athenian Agora (A. Xyngopoulos in *Eureterion ton mesaionikon mnemeion tes Hellados*, vol. 1.1, no.2 [Athens 1929], fig.74).

LIT. C. Delvoye, *RBK* 1:460–96. A. Khatchatrian, *Origine et typologie des baptistères paléochrétiens* (Paris 1982) 43, 69–82. S. Čurčić, "The Original Baptismal Font of Gračanica and its Iconographic Setting," *Zbornik Narodnog Muzeja* (Belgrade) 9–10 (1979) 313–23. —L.Ph.B.

**FOOD.** See DIET.

**FOOLS, HOLY** (σαλοί), a group of SAINTS gifted with extreme foresight who, in their humility, pretended to be half-witted ("fools for Christ's sake"). The series of holy fools begins with SYMEON OF EMESA who embodied—in an extreme form—protest against the traditional values of urban civilization; the Life of ANDREW THE FOOL is less extreme. The author of the Life of BASIL THE YOUNGER says that this saint claimed to be "foolish" (although he remained wise and learned) in order to escape the traps of the Devil (ed. Veselovskij, 1,50.33–4). The unpredictable and enigmatic actions and words of these saints manifest their freedom from earthly bondage and

their attachment to the heavenly world. A secularized version of the holy fool is found in the Life of PHILARETOS THE MERCIFUL, whose extraordinary generosity was viewed as "foolish" by his family and who was rewarded on earth with worldly well-being. Byzantine *saloi* found continuators and imitators in the Russian *jurodivye*.

LIT. A. Syrkin, "On the Behavior of the 'Fool for Christ's Sake,'" *History of Religions* 22 (1982) 150–71. L. Rydén, "The Holy Fool," in *Byz. Saint* 106–13. —A.K.

**FOOTSTOOL** (ὑποπόδιον, σουππέδιον), a normal concomitant of the THRONE and a symbol of relative superiority within sacred or social hierarchies. Following Isaiah 66:1 and Psalm 109:1, Christ is sometimes represented seated in heaven with his feet on a footstool connoting the world. At ceremonies, the EMPEROR stood or sat with his feet on a podium, a purple cushion, or porphyry disc (*rota*); in his portraits a more or less elaborate footstool is customary. When the figure of the emperor was centrally placed, even between an archangel and a church father (Spatharakis, *Portrait*, fig.72), the emperor's footstool implies that he outranked them. When a ruler or other mortal flanks a sacred figure, he is rarely elevated in this fashion. Ecclesiastics are almost never shown raised on a footstool. Some wooden footstools included a heating device (Koukoules, *Bios* 2.2:80f).

LIT. Treitinger, *Kaiseridee* 58f. —A.C., L.Ph.B.

**FOOTWEAR** (ὑποδήματα). In antiquity there were three kinds of footwear: open sandals fastened with leather straps, shoes covering the foot, and high boots. All three types were used in Byz., but boots seem to have become most common: the term TZANGION shifted from the sandal to the boot; Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 332.26–27) considered white boots, *krepides*, reaching up to the knees, as the typical footwear of a laborer; in artistic representations, the emperor and members of his family are always depicted wearing the same type of high red boots, adorned with little rows of pearls, esp. at the tips and ankles. The Virgin Mary is shown wearing this kind of footwear, although without pearls; their bright color contrasts with her dark robes. Angels too wear such boots when clad in the imperial LOROS.

Courtiers are depicted as shod in black, though



little can be seen of the form of their shoes under the long tunics. Active figures in shorter tunics are shown wearing high boots to the mid-calf, composed either of what looks like soft white leather above a hard black sole or of strap-work like a high sandal; in many of these cases it is hard to determine what is legging and what is shoe. Shepherds, such as those in scenes of the Nativity, occasionally wear fleece leggings above bare feet; bare feet are otherwise rare, reserved for peripheral figures such as demoniacs. John Chrysostom considered it shameful to appear in the agora without *hypodemata*, but going barefoot was a common form of penance and mortification of the flesh.

In art, monks and the clergy are depicted as wearing low black slippers, surely the *kaligia* mentioned in *typika*; for example, at the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople a monk was issued two pairs of *kaligia* annually (P. Gautier, *REB* 32 [1974] 65.609–10), at the Kosmosoteira at Bera one pair (L. Petit, *IRAIK* 13 [1908] 49.17). In the late Roman period one form of sandals was called *kampagia*. JOHN LYDOS (*De mag.* 30.22–32.5) described them as black footgear protecting the sole and toes and bound with leather straps to the ankle. They formed a part of the patrician costume. There were also military *kampagia* (Lat. *campagi militares*), mentioned in Diocletian's Price Edict; according to Malalas (Malal. 322.10–11), soldiers wore *kampagia* and *chlamydes* at festivities. In the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos and *De ceremoniis*, *kampagia* are the footgear of officials.

Footgear was produced by SHOEMAKERS from leather and cloth, esp. silk. Shoes were usually black or white, though bright colors (purple, green, blue) had social significance and were worn by the emperor and officials of highest ranks. Information on the price of shoes is scarce: in Diocletian's Price Edict it ranges between 50 and 120 denarii, in a Vazelon document of 1272 *kaligia* cost two asproi.

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 4:395–418. K. Wessel, *RBK* 3:445–48. —A.K., N.P.S.

**FOREIGNERS** (ξένοι, also *ethnikoi*) were equated in the late Roman Empire with BARBARIANS since it was assumed that the empire encompassed the entire civilized world, the OIKOUMENE. Foreigners were either direct enemies or MERCENARIES and

FOEDERATI. In the late 4th and 5th C. they dominated the Roman army, providing such high-ranking generals as GAINAS, STILICHO, and ASPAR; this provoked a xenophobic reaction sometimes expressed in demands for the restoration of a native army (SYNESIOS), sometimes in massacres of Germanic garrisons (whose soldiers were also unpopular as Arian heretics), and sometimes in attempts to replace foreigners by local tribes such as the Isaurians. After the 7th C. the mass recruitment of foreigners as mercenaries ceased, even though some foreign contingents (e.g., the "Persian tagma" of THEOPHOBOS) served in Byz. armies. The late 9th-C. *Kletorologion* of Philotheos (Oikonomides, *Listes* 177.29–30) lists as *ethnikoi* the Khazars, Hagarenes, Franks, and the enigmatic Pharganoi. The recruitment of foreigners (Rus', Franks-Normans, Englishmen, etc.) increased after the end of the 10th C. They formed a special corps of *ethnikoi* (e.g., *Lavra* 1, no.33.82) under the command of an *ethnarches* (Oikonomides, *Listes* 271.24) or *primikerios* of the *ethnikoi* (Zacos, *Seals* 2, no.732).

In the 12th C. the role of Turkish mercenaries became probably more important than that of Westerners. At the same time the character of Western infiltration began to change: from the 12th C. onward, Western residents tended to be diplomats and advisers rather than military commanders; an esp. significant group among them were MERCHANTS, primarily Italians (Venetians, Genoese, etc.), who settled in special colonies in both Constantinople and the provinces.

The government tried to make foreigners adjust to Byz. conditions: they were given lands and sometimes tax privileges, and marriage with Greeks was encouraged: the vita of Athanasia of Aegina refers to an edict that required all single women and widows to marry *ethnikoi* (F. Halkin, *Six inédits d'hagiologie byzantine* [Brussels 1987] 181.7–9). The attitude toward foreigners outside the empire was also shifting: the system of *foederati* gradually disappeared, and the concept of equilateral alliances with western, northern, and eastern powers (Frankish and later German empire, Caliphate, Khazar Khaganate, etc.) was introduced; the relations with allies were regulated by political and commercial TREATIES. Nevertheless the perception of foreigners as barbarians, heterodox, and schismatics prevailed; Kekaumenos argued against raising foreigners to high rank, Constantine VII

Porphyrogenetos discouraged imperial marriages with foreigners, and the number of such matches remained limited in the 10th and 11th C. In the 12th C. this attitude began to change, and the number of marriages with foreign princes increased dramatically. Niketas Choniates emphasized that there were bad and good foreigners and dared to create an idealized portrait of FREDERICK I BARBAROSSA. Commercial competition and the increasing political dominance of Italians in Byz. cities as well as the narrow-minded policy of the Catholic church and the Frankish princes on territories occupied by the Crusaders contributed to growing animosity against Westerners, while economic collaboration, mixed marriages, and the need for joint resistance to the Turks created a basis for better mutual understanding. This ambivalent situation is reflected in the unsuccessful attempt at UNION OF THE CHURCHES.

LIT. Kazhdan-Epstein, *Change* 167–96. M. Bibikov, "Das 'Ausland' in der byzantinischen Literatur des 12. und der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts," *BBA* 52 (1985) 61–72. —A.K.

**FORGERY, LITERARY**, a work whose actual author differs from the author whose name appears in the title. One should distinguish between medieval and modern forgeries. The latter were the creation of scholars (primarily from the 16th to early 19th C.) and were either ascribed to famous church fathers (e.g., A. Harnack, *Die Pfaffschen Irenäus-fragmente als Fälschungen Pfaffs nachgewiesen* [Leipzig 1900]) or were anonymous like the fragments of TOPARCHA GOTHICUS. Medieval forgeries include both legal (laws and documents) and literary texts. Byz. forgeries were prompted primarily by religious zeal, the need to refute heretical views and corroborate those of the author by apostolic or patristic authority, or to promote the veneration of a local saint or martyr whose biography remained obscure. Political interests of the state, of an institution (like the papacy), or noble family could play an important role, and economic claims were involved in issuing bogus monastic charters.

The forms of forgery varied: modest alterations and interpolations, fake translations (W. Speyer, *JbAChr* 11–12 [1968–69] 26–41), fake quotations in FLORILEGIA, false *prooimia* to genuine works, APOCRYPHA, Lives of saints of Apostolic times purportedly written by their disciples (e.g., PANKRA-

TIOS OF TAORMINA), pseudonyma, and false minutes of authoritative assemblies. The author of a fictitious text might even imitate archaic handwriting (L. Rydén, *DOP* 32 [1978] 132–34). Among the most notorious ancient and medieval forgeries are the HISTORIA AUGUSTA, pseudo-DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE, the APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS, and the DONATION OF CONSTANTINE. Many works were ascribed to famous writers (some to several different ones); others appear under unknown names, but the events described are chronologically misplaced.

LIT. W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum* (Munich 1971). G. Bardy, "Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne," *RHE* 32 (1936) 5–23, 275–302. O. Kresten, "Phantomgestalten in der byzantinischen Literaturgeschichte," *JÖB* 25 (1976) 207–22. Dölger, *Diplomatik* 384–402. E. Vranoussi, "Note sur quelques actes suspects ou faux de l'époque byzantine," in *PGEB* 505–10. A. Tuilier, "Remarques sur les fraudes des Apollinaristes et des Monophysites," in *Texte und Textkritik* (Berlin 1987) 581–90. P. Gray, "Forgery as an Instrument of Progress: Reconstructing the Theological Tradition in the Sixth Century," *BZ* 81 (1988) 284–89. —A.K.

**FORMOSUS**, pope (from 6 Oct. 891); born Rome? ca.815/16, died 4 Apr. 896. Bishop of Porto from 864, Formosus served as legate of Popes NICHOLAS I and HADRIAN II. In 866/7 he led a mission to Bulgaria to bring the country under Roman jurisdiction (Dujčev, *Medioevo* 1:183–92). He also played an important role at the Council in Rome (July 869) that anathematized Photios. A candidate for the papacy in 872, Formosus was defeated by JOHN VIII and soon thereafter deposed from his bishopric and banished. He was restored to his see, however, in 883 by Pope Marinus I and was elected pope after the death of Stephen V, despite already being bishop of another see. After he ascended the papal throne Formosus sought the support of Arnulf, king of the eastern Franks, who entered Rome and was crowned by Formosus. In his relations with Constantinople Formosus maintained neutrality between the parties of Photios and Ignatios.

LIT. A. Lapôte, *Études sur la papauté au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, vol. 1 (Turin 1978) 1–120. Dvornik, *Photian Schism* 251–62. G. Arnaldi, "Papa Formoso e gli imperatori della casa di Spoleto," *Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia. Università di Napoli* 1 (1951) 85–104. —A.K.

**FORMULARIES**, model books for drafting documents; used by major CHANCERIES and, more



often, by less educated and less pretentious NOTARIES. They reflect the reality that prevailed at a certain moment and in one particular part of the empire (the hypothesis of regional formularies has been suggested on the basis of the preserved notarial acts). Such collections of formulas, mostly from the 13th C. onward, are preserved in literary and legal MSS. The chancery formulas were classified either by possible addressee in order to guarantee the respect of etiquette (as shown in the EKTĒSIS NEA), or by subject in order to provide the proper rhetorico-philosophical prefaces for solemn documents (e.g., PROOIMIA).

ED. Sathas, *MB* 6:607-40. S. Lampros, *NE* 14 (1917) 20-23; 15 (1921) 152f, 164f, 337f. G. Ferrari, "Formulari notarili inediti dell'età bizantina," *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano* 33 (1913) 41-126. A. Dain, "Formules de 'Commission' pour un 'nomikos' et un 'eparchos,'" *REB* 16 (1958) 166-68; 22 (1964) 238-40. D. Simon, "Ein spät-byzantinisches Kaufformular," in *Flores Legum: Festschrift J. Scheltema* (Groningen 1971) 155-81. J. Darrouzès, "Deux formules d'actes patriarchaux," *TM* 8 (1981) 105-11.

-N.O.

**FORTIFICATIONS.** Fortification was a necessity that has left traces throughout the Byz. Empire, providing the most abundant and massive class of remains. Principles and techniques were inherited from the Romans; Byz. added little but consistently maintained a tradition of massive stone fortification. In the Roman defensive system, the main fortification was along the frontier (LIMES) where the bulk of the army was stationed, forming a network of fortresses strengthened by a deep militarized defensive zone. Within the empire, fortification was rare.

The invasions of the 3rd C. brought significant changes: thereafter, CITIES were regularly surrounded by walls, a response to the constant danger of attack. Major Byz. settlements were fortified and typically situated on a defensible hilltop. The fortress (KASTRON), which contained the garrison and civil and ecclesiastical officials, often became the core of a settlement that extended outside the walls (EMPORION). Characteristic Byz. fortifications consisted of fortified commercial cities (e.g., CONSTANTINOPLE, THESSALONIKE, ATTALeia); thematic capitals (NICAea, ANKYRA) that were important military bases; subordinate military outposts (KOTYAION); and forts that commanded routes by land (MALAGINA) and sea (HIERON). For the rural population, refuge sites were

extremely important, usually consisting of large and remote hilltops where the population of a district could flee at the time of attack. Monks also felt the need for defense, so monasteries in the countryside were commonly fortified (N.C. Moutsopoulos in *Pyrgoi kai Kastrá* [Thessalonike 1980] 8-43).

Byz. fortified sites were defended by man and by nature. Byz. defenses typically consisted of a curtain wall with projecting towers of varying shape and heavily fortified gates. They were massively built, with a core of mortared rubble and a facing whose nature varied with time and place. Elaborate fortifications had a lower outer wall (*proteichisma*). A moat (*taphros*) was common at sites on flat terrain. Defense was from platforms on the towers, where catapults and ballistas were employed, and from the parapets of the walls, manned by archers. Often a city had, besides the outer line of fortification, an inner citadel (*koula* in Kekaumenos). Larger fortifications had additional defensive levels in chambers within walls and in towers. Fortifications were generally designed to take advantage of a natural situation, usually a steep hilltop, a river, or other obstacle. Many were located for strategic reasons at road junctions, mountain passes, river crossings, or narrow straits.

While large structures like the walls of Constantinople, Nicaea, or Attaleia and barrier walls such as the HEXAMILION were imperial foundations, most Byz. fortifications are anonymous, and building inscriptions are very rare. It is likely that the majority were built and maintained by the government through imposition of the KASTROKTISIA, though the numerous refuge sites were probably the results of individual initiative. In the 11th C. and later, concessions allowed individuals to build fortifications on their estates, lay and monastic alike. The walls of Constantinople were manned by troops of low ranks, *noumera*, and *teichistai*, supplemented by the citizen militia; provincial fortifications were defended by the thematic troops, and minor fortifications by local landowners and citizens.

Byz. fortifications show a distinct historical development, with constant change until the end of the empire. The greatest Byz. fortification, which served as the model for many others, though never equalled, was the "land wall" of Constantinople (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS

OF), which had a triple rampart of moat, outer wall, and inner wall, and was carefully faced with ashlar masonry. At some distance from the "land wall" was the LONG WALL of Thrace. Justinian I built a great range of fortifications, with much variation according to circumstances (G. Ravagnani, *Castelli e città fortificate nel VI secolo* [Ravenna 1983]). In Africa, fortifications were usually small, of rectangular plan with corner towers, to protect a reduced population from revolt or attack, while in the Balkans networks of small forts centered on walled towns, or long fixed barriers such as the Hexamilion, ensured control of territory or blocked the passage of an enemy. These featured attached forts where the garrison could make a stand if the main line were overwhelmed. On the eastern frontier, subject to the assault of a sophisticated enemy skilled in the use of siege machinery (see ARTILLERY AND SIEGE MACHINERY), ramparts were raised, towers, outer walls, and moats were added, and citadels which could be held independently of the rest were frequently created (e.g., DARA).

The insecurity of the 7th C. produced an outburst of fortification in Asia Minor, where massive walls were constructed for cities which often withdrew to an ancient acropolis, and for the bases of the new theme system. Many of these are faced with a careful arrangement of reused architectural fragments and reflect a variety of defensive techniques: closely set pentagonal towers and elaborate gateways at ANKYRA, indented traces with few towers at SARDIS and EPHEsus. This period saw considerable construction of refuge forts, usually simply built of plain mortared rubble. Advances against the Arabs in the 9th C. involved a major program of fortification, manifesting stronger defensive techniques and a masonry of broken spoils and bands of brick: at Ankyra, the circuit received a massive outer wall and citadel while the inner wall was raised and a continuous covered gallery with loopholes was added to increase firepower; at Nicaea the number of towers was virtually doubled, and Kotyaion was built with a complete double circuit.

The Turkish invasions provoked the next significant period of fortification. Alexios I built simple coastal forts to provide bases for advance, while John II defended river crossings and roads by fortresses with towers of varied shape and a masonry of rubble and decorative brickwork. Un-

der Manuel I there was a defensive system, the NEOKASTRA, which included the massive walls of PERGAMON and several smaller forts set back in the hills. By his time, the idea of regular or decorative facing was in decline, and the strong concrete core was simply faced with rubble, covered by plaster for protection against the elements or the hooks of an enemy; walls were normally reinforced with an internal network of wooden beams which also attached the facing to the core. Adaptation to technological change is visible at Constantinople and Kotyaion, where Manuel I built towers suitable for the installation of the new heavier catapult, the trebuchet, and for use of the crossbow. The Laskarids were also great fortification builders, with notable results at Nicaea. Under the Palaiologoi, Western techniques, such as tall keeps and machicolation, played an increasing role. The last advance appears in the walls of John VIII at Constantinople, with round ports for firearms, which were fundamentally to transform fortification.

Until the 12th C., the art of fortification was far more developed in Byz. than the West. The great stone fortifications of the 7th C. have no counterpart in Europe. The CRUSADER CASTLES built in Syria, the Peloponnesos, and elsewhere, however, had innovative designs; and after the Crusades the West surpassed Byz., which has nothing to compare with the sophistication of French and English fortifications of the 13th C. Nevertheless, the walls of Byz. cities, which were usually far longer than those in Europe, proved adequate until the advent of cannon.

LIT. C. Foss, D. Winfield, *Byzantine Fortifications, an Introduction* (Pretoria 1986). A.W. Lawrence, "A Skeletal History of Byzantine Fortification," *BSA* 78 (1983) 171-227. T. Gregory, "The Fortified Cities of Byzantine Greece," *Archaeology* 35 (1982) 14-21. D. Ovčarov, *Vizantijski i bulgarski kreposti V-X vek* (Sofia 1982). -C.F.

**FORTY MARTYRS OF SEBASTEIA**, saints; feastday 9 March. According to the homily of BASIL THE GREAT (PG 31:508-40), they were soldiers condemned for their Christian beliefs; forced to stand naked all night in an icy lake, they froze to death. Their corpses were burned and the ashes thrown into the water. GREGORY OF NYSSA and esp. EPHREM THE SYRIAN developed the theme. Ephrem (or his Greek editor) provided a date and location for the martyrdom, near Pontic Sebasteia,





FORTY MARTYRS OF SEBASTEIA. Icon of the Forty Martyrs; mosaic, ca.1300. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

during the reign of Licinius (P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *infra* 160). The author of an anonymous *passio*, SYMEON METAPHRASTES, and several other writers praised the martyrs; the story influenced both the legend of the FIVE MARTYRS OF SEBASTEIA (AB 17 [1898] 468f) and that of the FORTY-TWO MARTYRS OF AMORION. In the *Testament of the Forty Martyrs* (preserved separately from the *passio*) the martyrs (all carefully listed) request that their relics be deposited "in the place called Sarein near [or under the jurisdiction of] the polis of Zela." Bonwetsch (*infra*), emphasizing the authenticity of the *Testament*, tried to discover in it traces of the original document. The cult of the martyrs spread broadly in the West and East; a Coptic MS of the 10th–11th C. presents a version very close to that of Basil (D.P. Buckle, *BullJ RylandsLib* 6 [1921–22] 355–57).

**Representation in Art.** Portraits of the Forty Martyrs as busts adorn monuments from Cappadocia to Rome, and the iconography of their mar-

tyrdom was almost as widespread and established as any biblical feast scene: forty half-naked men of varying ages standing huddled together in shallow water, some intrepidly supporting the faint, others praying or cowering with apprehension while Christ above witnesses their plight. Forty crowns sometimes hover in the sky over their heads. This composition, an almost "academic" study in male physique, was reused for the representation of a group of the damned in the Last Judgment frescoes in the *parekklesion* at CHORA. The basic composition, which appears first on 10th-C. ivories, was occasionally expanded to include an image of the bathhouse and the guard who substituted at the last moment for the single member of the group who lost heart and fled to the warmth of the bathhouse (e.g., at ASINOY). Other episodes of the legend were also illustrated: the attempted stoning of the saints, the beheading of the survivors of the frozen lake, and the burning, dispersal, and gathering of the relics (in the marginal PSALTERS, Der Nersessian, *L'illustration II* 92f, and in the prothesis of the Church of St. Sophia in OHRID). These scenes may reflect a lost cycle in Constantinople or in the martyr's church in Caesarea.

SOURCES. O. von Gebhardt, *Acta martyrum selecta: Ausgewählte Märtyreracten* (Berlin 1902) 166–81. D. Bonwetsch, "Das Testament der vierzig Märtyrer," *StGThK* 1.1 (Leipzig 1897) 75–80. D. Hagedorn, "PUG I 41 und die Namen der vierzig Märtyrer von Sebaste," *ZPapEpig* 55 (1984) 146–53.

LIT. BHG 1201–1208n. P. Franchi de'Cavalieri, "I santi quaranta martiri di Sebasteia," *ST* 49 (1928) 155–84. K.G. Kaster, *LCI* 8:550–53. O. Demus, "Two Palaeologan Mosaic Icons in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection," *DOP* 14 (1960) 96–109. Z. Gavrilović, "The Forty in Art," in *Byz. Saint* 190–94. Maguire, *Art & Eloquence* 36–42. A. Chatziniolaou, *RBK* 2:1059–61. —A.K., N.P.Š.

**FORTY-TWO MARTYRS OF AMORION**, legendary saints executed in 845 by the Arabs in Samarra; feastday 6 Mar. The monk Euodios wrote the martyrs' legend, probably soon after the event described. In a verbose preamble, he theorized that the adoption of heretical opinions by emperors caused all Byz. defeats; the capture of AMORION in 838 was the last link in the chain. Evidently confusing the caliph al-Mu'tasim (833–42) with his son al-Wāthiq (842–47), during whose reign the martyrs were executed, Euodios credits "Abesak," the *protosymboulos* of the Ishmaelites,

with seizing Amorion after a 13-day siege, slaughtering all the inhabitants and soldiers, and leading the commanders of seven themes into captivity. Theological discussions between the martyrs and various people dispatched to the jail by the *protosymboulos* (gymnosophists, officials, Greek traitors) make up the core of the legend. The martyrs remained steadfast during their seven-year ordeal, rejecting Islam and defending Christian values. Ethiopian executioners murdered them on the bank of the Euphrates. Apparently the last example of the genre of collective martyrdom (which did not survive the 9th C.), Euodios's legend was important to later literature: V. Vasil'evskij (*infra*, 101f) suggested that THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS was aware of Euodios; several versions of the legend appeared, including one ascribed to MICHAEL SYNKELLOS.

**Representation in Art.** Unlike their counterparts, the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia, these martyrs were rarely represented; they appear merely as a group of courtiers in chlamyses and tunics in a MS of the *menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes in Messina (Univ. Bibl., San Salvatore 27, fol.172v).

ED. *Skazaniya o 42 amorijskich mučenikach*, ed. V. Vasil'evskij, P. Nikitin (St. Petersburg 1905).

LIT. BHG 1209–1214c. A. Kazhdan, "Hagiographical Notes," *Byzantion* 56 (1986) 150–60. —A.K., N.P.Š.

**FORUM.** See AGORA. For forums of Constantinople, see CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF.

**FOUCHER OF CHARTRES.** See FULCHER OF CHARTRES.

**FOUNDER.** See KTETOR.

**FOUNTAIN OF LIFE.** The fountain of life (Gen 2:10) and its water were pervasive images of Christian salvation. Baptistery decoration throughout early Christendom showed the drinking harts of Psalm 42:1 (see DEER) or birds flanking vases. A 5th-C. floor mosaic at Iunca in Tunisia shows the four rivers of PARADISE flowing from a circular fountain that recalls the Holy Sepulchre in JERUSALEM; from the 7th C. onward the Holy Sepulchre itself was called "the fountain of our resurrection." Hymns call Christ a fountain of life and the source of the life-giving water that

flows through the Gospels to nourish the Church and link the water that flowed from his side at the Crucifixion with baptism. Art reflects this literary image only in the frontispiece to a 12th-C. Gospel book (E. Akurgal et al., *Treasures of Turkey* [Geneva 1966] 119); there, to illustrate a verse calling the Evangelists rivers of the Word, the Evangelists are depicted with John pointing to Christ as their source. A fountain came to signify the harmony of the Gospels—fourfold but issuing from one source—and the ornamental vases with birds or beasts found in illuminated MSS may refer to this. The Virgin Mary was known as the Zoodochos PEGE, or "life-giving fountain."

LIT. P.A. Underwood, "The Fountain of Life in Manuscripts of the Gospels," *DOP* 5 (1950) 41–138. T. Velmans, "Quelques versions rares du thème de la Fontaine de Vie dans l'art paléochrétien," *CahArch* 19 (1969) 29–43. R.S. Nelson, "Text and Image in a Byzantine Gospel Book in Istanbul (Ecumenical Patriarchate, cod. 3)" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1978) 187–97. —A.W.C.

**FOURTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.** See CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF.

**FOWL, DOMESTIC.** The GEOPONIKA (bk.14) preserves excerpts from ancient agronomists on domestic fowl, describing pigeons and hens as well as peacocks, pheasants, and ducks; the POULOGOS has almost exactly the same assortment of fowl—hens, pigeons, geese, pheasants, and peacocks. Chickens provided the Byz. with the best meat: the hen (*ornitha*) in the *Poulogos* (vv. 260–65) boasts that her chicks (*poulia*) have been eaten by bishops, exarchs, priests, Vardariotes, ambassadors, emperors, and senators, while a 12th-C. author (Eust. Thess., *Opuscula* 311.42–54) describes a fat, white *ornis* marinated in wine and stuffed with dumplings. Chickens formed a part of the KANISKION (e.g., *Ivir*. 1, no.29.97), and hens' eggs were common even in the houses of the poor (S. Papadimitriu, *Feodor Prodrom* [Odessa 1905] 165, n.107). John III Vatatzes encouraged the development of the poultry "industry" in western Asia Minor and presented his wife with a beautiful crown acquired with money earned from the sale of eggs. Domestic BIRDS other than chickens were rare; the martyr Tryphon is said to have fed geese in his boyhood (Rudakov, *Kultura* 281, n.96). PEACOCKS were popular on the estates of great



landlords such as Digenes Akritas, primarily to adorn the gardens. The *Geoponika* also recommends pigeon manure as fertilizer.

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 5:66–75. —A.K., J.W.N.

**FRACTION** (*ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου; μελισμός*, from *μερίζω*, “to dissect”), ritual breaking of the consecrated bread before COMMUNION. First mentioned in the New Testament, the ritual soon became a synonym for EUCHARIST (Acts 2:42). By the end of the 4th C. it was divided into a “symbolic” fraction and the “comminution” or actual breaking up of the bread for communion. Fraction first symbolized the participation of all in the one loaf as a sign of unity in one communion. By the 6th C. emphasis shifted to PASSION symbolism, with the bread seen as Christ’s “broken” body (Eutychios of Constantinople—PG 86.2:2396A; cf. Apophthegmata Patrum, PG 65:156C–160A); from the 12th C. “Lamb of God” (AMNOS) formulas accompany the “symbolic” fraction; and from the 13th C. the term *melismos* prevails, first appearing as a caption for images (e.g., the apse of SOPHOCANI) that show, with the stark eucharistic realism of medieval East and West, the Christ Child lying on the paten awaiting dismemberment (M. Gardis, *JÖB* 32.5 [1982] 495–502).

LIT. R. Taft, “Melismos and Comminution: The Fraction and its Symbolism in the Byzantine Tradition,” in *Traditio et progressio: Studi liturgici in onore del Prof. Adrien Nocent, OSB*, ed. G. Farnedi (Rome 1988) 531–52. —R.F.T.

**FRANCE** (*Φραγγία*, also *Γερμανία*—Ditten, *Russland-Exkurs* 124) emerged as a successor to the western Frankish empire after the consolidation of the territory around Paris during the 10th–12th C. Southern France (Provence, esp. MONTPELLIER) was involved in trade with the Levant, and the penetration of the CATHARS in this area shows the existence of cultural and religious ties with Byz. In 988 Hugh Capet planned to ask for a Byz. princess for his son Robert, but his letter probably was not sent (A. Vasiliev, *DOP* 6 [1951] 229–34). Manuel I, in his conflict with FREDERICK I BARBAROSSA, sought an alliance with Provence and France and married his son Alexios II to AGNES OF FRANCE. The French played a major role in the Crusades—first in the troops of independent nobles (GODFREY OF BOUILLON, Hugh of

Vermandois, RAYMOND OF TOULOUSE, etc.), then in the army of LOUIS VII. The French contingents of the Fourth Crusade were significant; Thibaut of Champagne was its first leader, replaced, after his sudden death, by BONIFACE OF MONTFERRAT. After the sack of Constantinople in 1204 BALDWIN OF FLANDERS became the first Latin emperor, Boniface received the kingdom of Thessalonike, and many French knights won various fiefs. From 1261 until 1453, Byz. emperors made frequent appeals to France for assistance against the Turks. The emperor MANUEL II PALAIOLOGOS went so far as to travel to Paris (1400–01) to plead his case to Charles VI (1380–1422), but apart from a small contingent of troops received very little help.

LIT. V.K. Ronin, “Vizantija v sisteme vnešnepolitičeskich predstavlenij rannekarolingskich pisatelej,” *VizVrem* 47 (1986) 85–94. M. Dąbrowska, *Bizancjum, Francja i Stolika apostolska w drugiej połowie XIII wieku* (Lodz 1986). Eadem, “L’attitude pro-byzantine de St. Louis,” *BS* 50 (1989) 11–23. R.A. Jackson, “De l’influence du cérémonial byzantin sur le sacre des rois de France,” *Byzantion* 51 (1981) 201–10. —A.K., R.B.H.

**FRANCISCANS**, the Order of Friars Minor or Minorites (called *φρέριοι* by the Byz.). Founded by Francis of Assisi in 1209, the order expanded rapidly, numbering approximately 3,000 friars by 1221. It soon planned missionary expeditions to the East to convert the Muslims. Francis himself made a trip to the Holy Land in 1219 and then preached at the court of the sultan in Egypt. Other Franciscans soon became involved in missionary activities in the East, including Constantinople and Kaffa. By 1220 the Franciscans were influential at the court of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. In the 13th C. the Franciscan province of Romania expanded to roughly 20 convents. A number of Franciscan theologians, many of whom spoke Greek, served as papal legates to the Byz. court in Nicaea to discuss controversial points of theology, thus preparing the way for the Union of Lyons in 1274. The earliest of these was the English Franciscan, Haymo of Faversham, a master of theology at the University of Paris, whom Pope GREGORY IX sent to Emp. John III Vatatzes in 1234 to discuss the UNION OF THE CHURCHES. The practice continued until the decisive missions of the Greek-born Franciscan, John Parastron, who accepted Mi-

chael VIII’s profession of faith prior to the Council of LYONS and also acted as interpreter there.

The most visible mark of the order’s presence in the capital during the Latin occupation of 1204–61 is a cycle of frescoes devoted to the life of St. FRANCIS in KALENDERHANE CAMIL. When the Byz. recaptured Constantinople in 1261, the last Latin patriarch of the city left a member of the order there as his vicar, although the Franciscan convent was evidently abandoned. In ca.1296, however, the Franciscans returned and kept a convent in CONSTANTINOPLE until they were again expelled in 1307. Thereafter they maintained their house in PERA, continuing to serve as imperial emissaries to the pope as well as papal envoys to the imperial court throughout the 14th C. Some Franciscan churches built in the Greek provinces still survive, esp. on Crete.

LIT. R.L. Wolff, “The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Franciscans,” *Traditio* 2 (1944) 213–37. M. Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs et l’Eglise grecque orthodoxe au XIIIe siècle (1231–1274)* (Cairo 1954). B. Altaner, “Die Kenntnis des Griechischen in den Missionsorden während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts,” *ZKirch* 53 (1934) 436–93. B.K. Panagopoulos, *Cistercian and Mendicant Monasteries in Medieval Greece* (Chicago 1979) 93f, 102–11. —F.K., A.C.

**FRANKOI** (*Φράγγοι, Φράγκοι*), ethnic term derived from the Latin term *Franci*. Prokopios, Agathias, Theophanes, and even Constantine VII equated the Frankoi with the GERMANOI in general, and at the same time used the term specifically to describe the FRANKS; thus Theophanes (Theoph. 455.20) spoke of CHARLEMAGNE as a “king of the Frankoi.” In the 10th C. the term was transferred to the Germans, and OTTO I THE GREAT was addressed as the king or even *basileus* of the Frankoi. In the 11th C., the term lost any precise significance: *Frankoi* or *Phrangopouloi* primarily designated Normans from Italy, but Niketas Choniates contrasted “the tribe of the Frankoi” (Nik.Chon. 66.12), meaning the French, with the Alamanoi (ALEMANNI) or Germans. Frankoi are listed in some chrysobulls of Alexios I, sometimes between the Inglinoi or English, and Nemitzoi or Germans (e.g., *Lavra* 1, no.48.28, a.1086), but it is hard to decide whether Normans or French were meant.

The term was ultimately expanded to include the whole Catholic population of Europe; for example, Sphrantzes (Sphr. 58.21–23) defined

Frankoi as “Western Christians.” The word came to have a pejorative and negative connotation, and in 1274 a mob in Constantinople taunted and accused George Metochites—envoy of Michael VIII, who had agreed to ecclesiastical union at Lyons—of becoming a Frank.

LIT. W. Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt 1979) 227–54. I. Moles, “Nationalism and Byzantine Greece,” *GRBS* 10 (1969) 95–108. —R.B.H., A.K.

**FRANKOPOULOS**. See PHRANGOPOULOS.

**FRANKS**, a Germanic people, probably formed during the 3rd C. from a regrouping of several different tribes that inhabited the eastern bank of the lower Rhine. Subdued by Constantius Chlorus and Constantine I, the Franks were heavily recruited into the Roman army and a segment known as the Salians was settled in what is now the Netherlands. In the early 6th C., the Franks were united politically by Clovis (Chlodovechus, 481/2–511), who extended Frankish rule over the whole of Roman Gaul with the exception of Septimania and Provence. Clovis also converted to Orthodox Christianity, the first barbarian king to do so. This conversion and his victory over the VISIGOTHS (508) contributed to a Byz. perception of the Franks as potential allies against the Arian Gothic kingdoms and later the Lombards in Italy. Merovingian kings from Clovis onward were frequently honored by Constantinople with the titles *consul* and *patrikios*.

Relations between the Franks and Byz. were often strained over conflicting interests in Italy, a situation exploited by the papacy in its struggle to extricate itself from Byz. control. The papal coronation of CHARLEMAGNE in 800 brought the Franks into political, religious, and ideological competition with Byz., while Charlemagne’s victory over the AVARS was a threat to Byz. influence on the Lower Danube. The decline of the Frankish empire in the 9th C. and its division into three parts by the Treaty of Verdun in 843 decreased the rivalry; Arab attacks on Italy even contributed to an alliance between Louis II and Basil I. In the 10th C. the role of the Western Empire was assumed by GERMANY, and creation of the kingdom of FRANCE began.

LIT. I. Musset, *The Barbarian Invasions* (London 1975) 68–80. P.J. Geary, *Before France and Germany* (Oxford 1988).



E. James, *The Origins of France* (Hong Kong 1982). A. Gasquet, *L'Empire byzantin et la monarchie franque* (Paris 1888; rp. New York 1972). P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam* 2.1 (Paris 1956). —R.B.H.

**FREDERICK I BARBAROSSA** (It., lit. "Red-Beard"), king of Germany (1152–90) and Western emperor (crowned Rome 18 June 1155); born ca. 1125, died near SELEUKIA in Isauria 10 June 1190. When he succeeded CONRAD III, Frederick (*Φρεδερίχος*) considered marrying a Byz. princess. He deemed the invasion of southern Italy (1155–57) by MANUEL I a threat to his own claims there. When Manuel allied himself with William I of Sicily (1158), Frederick became his major Western opponent. Against Byz. pressure Frederick sought to maintain German ascendancy over Hungary; with the installation of BÉLA III, Manuel triumphed there. From 1165 Manuel subsidized the League of Lombard towns in northern Italy, which in 1176 defeated Frederick (P. Clasen, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze* [Sigmaringen 1983] 155–70). Pope ALEXANDER III also opposed Frederick and ca. 1166–67 considered recognizing Manuel as sole emperor (*ibid.*, 176–83; R.-J. Lillie, *ByzF* 9 [1985] 237–43). When in 1189 Frederick led the German portion of the Third Crusade through Byz. territory, ISAAC II (to fulfill his agreement with Saladin) attempted to trap him in Thrace. German devastation compelled Isaac to yield (Treaty of Adrianople, 14 Feb. 1190). Frederick passed through Byz. Anatolia with little friction. Niketas CHONIATES admired Frederick's devotion to the Crusade's goal.

LIT. Ohnsorge, *Abend. & Byz.* 411–91. G. Cankova-Petkova, "Friedrich I. Barbarossa und die sozial-politischen Verhältnisse auf dem Balkan zur Zeit des III. Kreuzzuges," *Palaeobulgarica* 6.2 (1982) 69–74. E. Eickhoff, *Friedrich Barbarossa im Orient: Kreuzzug und Tod Friedrichs I.* [IstMitt, supp. 17] (Tübingen 1977). K. Zeillinger, "Friedrich I. Barbarossa, Manuel I. Komnenos und Süditalien in den Jahren 1155/56," *RömHistMitt* 27 (1985) 53–83. —C.M.B.

**FREDERICK II HOHENSTAUFEN**, king of Sicily (1198–1250), German emperor (1212–50); born Jesi 26 Dec. 1194, died Fiorentino 13 Dec. 1250. In his long struggle with the papacy, Frederick found it useful to build up contacts in Byz., esp. with JOHN III VATATZES (E. Merendino, *Byzantino-Sicula* 2 [1974] 371–83). By the late 1230s rumors were circulating in the West that Vatatzes had promised to do homage to Frederick if he helped

him recover Constantinople. The Nicaean emperor contributed troops to Frederick's forces at the siege of Brescia in 1238. In return, Frederick barred passage through southern Italy to forces going to the rescue of Latin Constantinople. If never technically a vassal, the Nicaean emperor allowed himself to be bound very closely to Frederick by marrying Frederick's illegitimate daughter, Constance Lancia ("Anna"), ca. 1244 (*Reg* 3, no. 1779). Vatatzes gained little from this alliance.

When papal forces defeated Frederick at Parma in 1248, Vatatzes decided that more might be gained from the papacy. In 1249 the Nicaean emperor reached an understanding with papal envoys over the question of the UNION OF THE CHURCHES. The Hohenstaufen connection seems to have polarized the Nicaean court between those who wanted rapprochement with the papacy and those, like THEODORE II LASKARIS, who favored a continuing understanding with the Hohenstaufen. Theodore was much impressed by this upholder of the ideal of imperial authority in the face of the challenge from the papacy.

Frederick's chancery was able to conduct its diplomacy with Byz. in Greek. Frederick's patronage of Greek men of letters contributed to the last flowering of Greek literature in southern Italy, centered on the monastery of S. Nicola di Casole (M. Gigante, *Poeti bizantini di Terra d'Otranto del secolo XIII*<sup>2</sup> [Galatina 1986]).

LIT. D. Jacoby, "The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Collapse of the Hohenstaufen Power in the Levant," *DOP* 40 (1986) 83–101. E.H. Kantorowicz, *Frederick the Second*, Eng. tr. (New York 1957). P. Žavoronkov, "Nikejskaja imperija i Zapad," *VizVrem* 36 (1974) 110–14. —M.J.A.

**FREEDOM** (*ἐλευθερία*), a concept developed in antiquity as the opposite of SLAVERY and potential enslavement by the barbaric world. Freedom was conceived of as the possibility of free actions limited by virtue and responsibility, that is, by inner and social factors. STOICISM introduced the concept of DETERMINISM (as opposed to FREE WILL) and saw freedom as the acceptance of fate. Christianity made the problem even more complex by replacing blind fate with God's providence (PRONOIA) and by emphasizing the ethical and soteriological aspect of freedom. The problem became evident in discussion incited by Pelagius (see PELAGIANISM) and in Christian refutations of Manichaean DUALISM. John of Damascus, using NE-

MESIOS and some other predecessors, formulated that man is *autexousios*, possessing free will, and responsible for evil-doing since God cannot be the cause of bad behavior; neither necessity (*ananke* or *heimarmene*, for eternal phenomena), nor nature (for plants and animals), nor TYCHE (for chance events), nor *automaton* (sheer coincidence) determines events (*Exp. fidei* 39.23–39, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:97). Man is free to choose his actions, even though sometimes providence prevents his plans from achieving fulfillment (*Exp. fidei* 40.17–18, p.98). Freedom can be the source of wrongdoing: the ideal of behavior is the renunciation of desires and full subordination to God, whereas demons and evildoers are free.

Parallel to this transformation of ancient freedom into Byz. subordination was a shift in the perception of slavery: the saint became the slave (*doulos*) of God, the courtier the slave of the emperor. Political *eleutheria* acquired a new meaning not connected to the idea of a free and civilized society: *eleutheria* began to designate tax exemption, and ELEUTHEROI were those people free from state taxes.

LIT. D. Nestle, *Eleutheria: Studien zum Wesen der Freiheit bei den Griechen und im Neuen Testament*, 1. *Die Griechen* (Tübingen 1967). S. Lyonnet, *Liberté chrétienne et loi de l'Esprit selon Saint Paul* (Paris 1954). H. Beck, *Vorsehung und Vorherbestimmung in der theologischen Literatur der Byzantiner* (Rome 1937). —A.K.

**FREE WILL** (*θέλημα γνωμικόν*, "will of choice"), a concept that stands at the center of the controversy over MONOTHELETISM. Patr. SERGIOS I argued in his letter to Pope Honorius that two contradictory wills in Christ, the divine and human, cannot be accepted because such an idea would establish in him two "subjects" or "persons," thereby falling into the heresy of NESTORIANISM. It is the hypostasis of the Logos who is freely obedient to God, experiencing no conflict and moving the human reality of Christ.

For MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR the doctrine of "one hypostatic will of the Logos" leads to the negation of a free human will in Christ, and consequently to the abrogation of the nature of the soul. On the other hand, he agrees with the Monothelites that any opposition to the will of God, even in Gethsemane, must be excluded in Christ, and that a unity that consists only in a common goal possessed by two wills is not suffi-

cient to protect against this. Further, he agrees that such a view ultimately implies Nestorianism. The human will of Christ, so he argues, must be understood as a capacity of self-determination belonging to human nature, but not as a will of choice. Such a gnomic will is found only in a "person" or hypostasis "enabled" to make decisions, or better, condemned, because this freedom of choice is merely a deficient mode of freedom, rooted not in man's true nature, but in his existential condition after the sin of Adam. For Maximos, Adam possessed no gnomic will before his sin, and yet he sinned.

John of Damascus took up the doctrine that Christ possessed no human gnomic will on account of the hypostatic union; yet one can speak of one gnomic will of Christ precisely because of the hypostatic union and the unity of the willed objective (meaning that "in both his natures he wills and acts for our salvation"). "For the natural human will" in Christ willed the same as God (*Exp. fidei* 36.104, 120–23, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:91f). PHOTIOS, who quotes this text in his *Amphilochia* (80.60–86, ed. L.G. Westerink, 5:113f), concludes that neither God nor Christ has a gnomic will (80.184–225, p.117f).

LIT. Balthasar, *Kosmische Lit.* 262–69. K.-H. Uthemann, "Das anthropologische Modell der hypostatischen Union," *Kleronomia* 14 (1982) 285–293. —K.-H.U.

**FRESCO TECHNIQUE.** A modified *buon fresco*, involving the application of lime-binding pigments directly to a layer of fine wet plaster added over an initial plaster coat, was used throughout Byz. times as an alternative to MOSAIC for wall decoration. No Byz. term corresponds exclusively to this technique. Because of its relative cheapness or its inherent modeling potential, fresco became increasingly popular in the 13th–14th C.

Examination of frescoes as well as literary allusions to painting indicate that pigments were applied in layers, even though the mixing of pigments in the modeling of flesh is found occasionally. Final flesh pigments, black or dark ochre outlines, and white highlights as well as inscriptions were normally added only after the initial layers of the painting had dried, a practice that has contributed to their loss. The range of COLOR was limited to natural pigments that remained stable in conjunction with the lime of the plaster, for example,



lime white and lime putty, ochres varying from bright red and yellow to dark brown, earth green, and carbon black. A black wash was commonly used under blue (azurite) or green to produce a dark ground. The appearance of more expensive pigments such as ultramarine blue (from lapis lazuli) and gold and silver foil distinguish lavish works. Vermilion is also not unusual, although it tends to turn black. The rich coloristic impression given by many surviving fresco programs is a testament to the ingenuity with which masters manipulated their limited palette.

LIT. D.V. Thompson, *The Materials and Techniques of Medieval Painting* (New York 1956). Winfield, "Painting Methods." *The Painter's Manual of Dionysius of Fourna*, tr. P. Hetherington (London 1974) 4–16. —A.J.W.

**FRIENDSHIP** (φιλία) was an important category of ancient ETHICS, praised in both myth and philosophy. The church fathers, although not rejecting *philia*, contrasted it with true spiritual LOVE or *agape*. According to BASIL THE GREAT (ep. 133, ed. Y. Courtonne, 2:47.1–2), "corporeal" friendship is a condition fostered by long association. Byz. epistolography preserved a stereotypical attitude toward friendship, with pertinent complaints about the friend's silence. In the 11th C. the question of friendship was much discussed; Symeon the Theologian and Kekaumenos denied that friendship was a virtue, the latter opposing to it the nuclear family and the former the individual path of salvation. In contrast, Michael Psellos highly approved of friendship in theory and acted energetically on behalf of his friends in practice. In Niketas Choniates, the notion of *philia* acquires a broad range of meanings: alliance between states, semifeudal allegiance, political support, respect, although "pure friendship" appears infrequently. While antiquity emphasized primarily male friendship, the church fathers introduced the concept of heterosexual friendship between two celibate persons; equal "in Christ," the partners in this relationship appear often as the male instructor and female apprentice.

LIT. L. Vischer, "Das Problem der Freundschaft bei den Kirchenvätern," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 9 (1953) 173–200. K. Treu, "Philia und agape," *Studii classici* 3 (1961) 421–27. F. Tinnefeld, "'Freundschaft' in den Briefen des Michael Psellos," *JÖB* 22 (1973) 151–68. Kazhdan-Constable, *Byzantium* 28f. —A.K.



Ὁ τίς κερμόδισιδονμότιβυβωύχολι κωδωμμέομ.  
 Ἐφυμώφίμιαμ· κωάποφφλασάμφλβ· πώμ· ι· α·  
 ρ· ο· ω· α· δ· α· σ· τ· ο· ι· σ· β· ρ· ε· λ· φ· β· β· μ· κ· α· ε· μ· π· α· σ· ι· ο· ι· ε· ο·

FRIEZE GOSPELS. Miniature from a frieze Gospel page (Paris gr. 74, fol. 4v); 11th C. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. The miniature depicts the Flight into Egypt.

**FRIEZE GOSPELS**, conventional term for illustrated MSS in which successive scenes, in the narrative order of each Gospel, are arranged in strips across the page and within the body of the text block. Illustrations of these MSS also include headpiece miniatures (S. Tsuji, *DOP* 29 [1975] 165–203) and Evangelist portraits. Only two such books (Florence, Laur. 6.26 and Paris, B.N. gr. 74), of the 11th or early 12th C., survive.

LIT. T. Velmans, *La Tétravangile de la Laurentienne* (Paris 1971). H. Omont, *Évangiles avec peintures byzantines du XIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris n.d.). —A.C.

**FRONTALITY**, the arrangement of figures in a work of art so that the beholder engages them face to face. Like the related principle of SYMMETRY, it is fundamental in Byz. composition. Following the decline of three-dimensional SCULPTURE, which allowed a virtually infinite variety of axes and poses, frontality became pronounced on aulic reliefs such as the base of the OBELISK OF THEODOSIOS in the Hippodrome and generally in PORTRAITS AND PORTRAITURE. Almost invariably the most important figure in an image is shown in this manner, although in compositions such as the ANASTASIS the effect may be mitigated by the protagonist's attitude toward other participants. Established in icon painting by the 6th C., frontality became a dominant formal characteristic, allowing immediate recognition of a holy figure, his or her accessibility and, above all, the intensity

of private communication. That the Byz. were conscious of this unmediated experience even in monumental decoration is demonstrated by the ekphrasis of the Pantokrator in the Church of the HOLY APOSTLES (Constantinople) written by Nicholas MESARITES (ed. Downey, 870, 901).

LIT. Demus, *Byz. Mosaic* 7f. 27–29. M. Schapiro, *Words and Pictures* (The Hague–Paris 1973) 38–49, 59–63. K.M. Swoboda, "Die Frontalfigur zwischen Spätantike und Frühgotik," in *Arte in Europa. Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Edoardo Arslan*, vol. 1 (Milan 1966) 271–77. —A.C.

**FRONTIER** (ὄριον). In antiquity the frontier was considered as a demarcation line between the civilized OIKOUMENE and the "savage" world of the BARBARIAN; its significance was more cultural than political and therefore fluctuated. Regular relations with the Persian Empire, and later with the Arab caliphate, contributed to a clarification of the legal concept of a frontier, while necessities of defense produced a concrete, physical notion of a border. Prokopios, who paid serious attention to the problem of frontiers, recognized them as following natural barriers—RIVERS, mountains, deserts, seas; the LIMES was a manmade fortified frontier. The idea of frontier, however, was not consistently applied: for a long period Cyprus was shared between the Arabs and the Byz., while certain independent regions and cities were considered (theoretically) as parts of Byz. territory under the command of Byz. officials (or local rulers adorned with Byz. titles). Intermediary zones populated by bilingual settlers, subject to regular raids from both sides and owing uncertain allegiance, commonly existed along Byz. frontiers (such was the milieu of DIGENES AKRITAS). This legal disequilibrium resulted in the application to state frontiers of terms such as *horothesion* or *synonion*, which were normally used for rural boundary marks. The existence of foreign enclaves made the system of frontiers even more confused.

Border areas, despite their dangerous military situation, contributed much to cultural and ethnic exchange (by means of mixed marriages) and often served as cradles for new development: thus the new nobility of the 11th–12th C. came primarily from the borderlands of eastern Asia Minor and Macedonia, and innovative military tac-

tics were developed in frontier KLEISOURAI (Z. Udal'cova, A. Kazhdan, Hr. Bartikjan, 14 *CEB*, vol. 1 [Bucharest 1974] 231–36).

LIT. Koder, *Lebensraum* 62–102. *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, ed. P. Freeman, D. Kennedy, 2 vols. (Oxford 1986). W. Kaegi, "The Frontier: Barrier or Bridge?" 17 *CEB Major Papers* (Washington, D.C., 1986) 279–303. Ahrweiler, *Byzance: Les pays*, pt.III (1974), 209–30. Ja. Ferluga, "I confini dell'impero Romano d'Oriente," in *Popoli e spazio Romano tra diritto e profezia* (Naples 1986) 365–400. J. Duneau, J. Arrignon, "Ponjatie 'granica' u Prokopija Kesarijskogo i Konstantina Bagrijanorodnogo," *VizVrem* 13 (1982) 64–73. J. Haldon, H. Kennedy, "The Arab-Byzantine Frontier in the Eighth and Ninth c.," *ZRVI* 19 (1980) 79–106. —A.K.

**FRUIT** (καρποί) was an important component of the Byz. DIET. The GEOPONIKA (bk.10.74) preserves an ancient categorization of fruit into *opora* (soft) and *akrodrya* (hard-shelled); to the latter group, besides the walnut, chestnut, and pistachio, belonged the pomegranate. The PORIKOLOGOS gives a long list of fruit: quince, citron, pear, apple, cherry, plum, fig, etc., whereas the walnut, almond, and chestnut form a separate category characterized as "Varangians." The peach ("Persian apple") was also known. Fruit trees were planted in GARDENS, while nuts and chestnuts usually grew in groves. A poor peasant might possess only a single tree, as did an *agroikos* in the vita of Michael Maleinos (L. Petit, *ROC* 7 [1902] 563.12–19) whose only asset was a pear tree. The *praktika* of the 14th C. mention pear, fig, walnut, cherry, almond, and mulberry trees; according to Laiou (*Peasant Society* 29f), the peasants of the Iveron estates in the village of Gonatou owned, on the average, 20 trees each in 1320. Calculations by N. Kondov (*infra*) show that in the northern Balkans the pear tree was more common than the apple and the cherry tree more common than the plum. Wild berries were also gathered: some saints are described as picking wild strawberries (*hoamua*).

Some fruits were grown for market, but the Byz. preferred produce from their own gardens: the fruit imported by Bulgaria, stated Gregory Antiochos (J. Darrouzès, *BS* 23 [1962] 279.39–48), was spoiled—the apples wrinkled, the pears bruised, the figs dried up, having lost their sweetness during their lengthy transport.

As in the Roman tradition, artists continued to use fruit and foliage as symbols of abundance,



attached to WREATHS and other forms of ornament.

LIT. N. Kondov, *Ovoščarstvuo v bŭlgarskite zemi prez srednovkovieto* (Sofia 1969). Dölger, *Schatz.* 188.

—A.K., J.W.N., A.C.

**FRUIT BOOK.** See PORIKOLOGOS.

**FULCHER OF CHARTRES**, priest; participant in and chronicler of the First Crusade; chaplain of Baldwin I; born ca.1058, died 1127/8. At Jerusalem in late 1101 Fulcher began a *Jerusalem History* (*Historia Hierosolymitana*), whose lost first version apparently narrated events to 1105 and was known, for example, to GUIBERT OF NOGENT. Fulcher later pursued his account down to 1124; ca.1127 he revised and continued the whole to constitute its present form. WILLIAM OF TYRE exploited his work, and in the 13th C. it was shortened and translated into French. Fulcher's first sections (pp. 171–214) record the Crusaders' travels across the Balkans, his wonderment at the wealth, beauty, merchants, and "20,000 eunuchs" of Constantinople, relations with Emp. Alexios I, and the siege of Nicaea. He documents the return of some of the Crusaders to Europe via Constantinople (pp. 318–21), Bohemund's war with Byz. in 1107–08 (pp. 518–25), and deplores Venetian raids on the Byz. Aegean in 1125 (pp. 758–61).

ED. *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127)*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg 1913). *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem 1095–1127*, tr. F.R. Ryan, ed. H.S. Fink (Knoxville, Tenn., 1969).

LIT. J. Richard, *DHGE* 17 (1971) 1257. *RepFontHist* 4:601.

—M.McC.

**FUNERAL** (κηδεία). This rite had a double purpose: to say farewell to the deceased and to assist the soul in its ascent to heaven. The ritual had three major stages: preparation of the body and soul at the home of the deceased, the funerary procession, and the graveside service and BURIAL. Preparations began immediately after a person's death with the washing and clothing of his body. Normally, relatives washed the body with warm water mixed with wine and spices, anointed it with perfume, wrapped it in appropriate garments, and closed the eyes and mouth. All these stages are subsumed in representations of Christ's Passion (K. Weitzmann in *De artibus opuscula XL*, ed. M. Meiss [New York 1961] 476–90).

Typical burial garb consisted of a swaddling linen cloth and the shroud. White linen garments were customary among the majority; for example, Constantine I the Great was buried in his white linen baptismal robe. Monks and clergy, however, were clad in clerical vestments according to their rank. Luxurious garments often distinguished imperial or wealthy personages. Exceptions were made to meet the last wishes of individuals: thus, the vita of the 9th-C. saint EUDOKIMOS reports that he asked his colleagues to place him in a coffin dressed in military garb with an attached sword and to give him honors of a *strategos*, the position he occupied in his lifetime (ed. Loparev, pp. 209:8.30–35; 210:8.5). Those devoted to him even covered his coffin with the blanket under which he died (*ibid.*, 211:9.20). On the other hand, MELANIA THE YOUNGER was buried in garments associated with saints (*vita*, ed. Gorce 268.13–270.3).

After burial preparations, the corpse of a lay person was displayed on a small couch in a room or vestibule of a house for mourning and lamentation by family and friends. The body was oriented so that it faced east, with hands crossed on the chest and holding an icon; candles and incense burned alongside the corpse. Sometimes holy bread was put into the corpse's hands, but the church prohibited offering communion to the dead. The singing of psalms over the body served to protect the soul against demons. The coffin of a monk or cleric was placed in the narthex of a church. When LAZAROS OF MT. GALESIOS died, his body was brought into the church, laid on the floor, and his leather chiton and fetters removed; then, probably after washing him, the monks replaced his chiton, laid him on a couch in the narthex, and prepared a coffin of cypresswood (AASS Nov. 3:587E–588A).

Following the visitation period, the funeral procession set off for the burial with lamps and burning incense, the cortèges of saints or emperors attracting large crowds. If the corpse had to be transported some distance to its final resting place (e.g., Alexios, the older son of John II), it was embalmed or simply placed in a closed coffin.

Mourners typically engaged in lamentations and tragic GESTURES (tears, beating the chest, pulling out the hair). Chrysostom, however, urged the replacement of wailing with the singing of psalms. Some rigorously ascetic saints also protested against

exaggerated expression of EMOTIONS: BASIL THE YOUNGER (*vita*, ed. Vilinskij 1:333.13–23) forbade laments and beating the chest at his funeral, since he considered it a time of rejoicing and entrance into "the spiritual marriage chamber."

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 4:148–85. D. Abrahamse, "Rituals of Death in the Middle Byzantine Period," *GOrThR* 29 (1984) 125–34. G. Spyridakis, "Ta kata ten teleuten ethima ton Byzantinon," *EEBS* 20 (1950) 75–171. V. Bruni, *I funerali di un sacerdote nel rito bizantino* (Jerusalem 1972). I.-H. Dalmais, *Les liturgies d'Orient* (Paris 1980) 123f.

—Ap.K., A.K., N.T., A.C.

**FURNITURE.** The main pieces in a Byz. household were BEDS; TABLES; various seats (benches, chairs, *thronoi*), sometimes with FOOTSTOOLS; chests with LOCKS; and "small towers" (*pyrgiskoi*) for precious objects. In a broader sense, furnishings included CARPETS, CURTAINS (KATAPETASMATA), and lighting devices (LAMPS). Hagiographers and authors of sermons often mention precious pieces of furniture, covered with ivory plaques, silver, or gold. On the other hand, wills and inventories of the 11th–15th C. list icons; books; and gold, silver, bronze, or glass VESSELS, but are strangely silent about beds, tables, and chairs.

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 2.2:67–96. M. Poljakovskaja, A. Čekalova, *Vizantija: byt i nraivy* (Sverdlovsk 1989) 125f.

—A.K.

**FURRIER** (γουνάριος). The word *gounarios* is unknown before the 6th C. Fikhman (*Egipet* 30) suggests that *kaunakoplokos* and related terms used in some papyri designated furriers, but their context is unclear; S. Calderini (*Aegyptus* 26 [1946] 17) translates it as "weaver of wool." Constantinopolitan furriers had their shops in the Forum (of Constantine?), where as early as 532 stood the basilica of the *gounarioi*; the structure was damaged at least twice by fire (Janin, *CP byz.* 98). In

14th-C. Constantinople there was a flourishing business of processing furs imported from the north: a contract of apprenticeship to a furrier survives from this period (G. Ferrari dalle Spade, *SBN* 4 [1935] 264), and a Latin document of 1313 mentions a furriers' house in the quarter of *Peliparii* or "furriers" (Loenertz, *ByzFrGr I* 425, no.4). Many furriers were Jews, esp. Jews from Venice (Matschke, *Fortschritt* 96f).

—A.K.

**FUSTĀT, AL-**, medieval Egyptian town at the southern end of the Nile delta. In late Roman times the site was occupied by the fortress of Babylon, and it was the camp (*fossaton*) of the besieging forces of 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ in 640/1 that evolved into the Arab town. From a garrison for Arab forces advancing across North Africa, al-Fustāt soon became the capital of EGYPT. Its position gave it control over Nile commerce, particularly the vital grain trade, and a leading role in traffic moving along the southern Mediterranean coast. Byz. ships often called at al-Fustāt, Byz. goods (esp. TEXTILES) were extensively traded, and by the time of the FĀṬĪMĪDS many Byz. merchants and craftsmen had settled there.

Al-Fustāt also figured in the conflict with Byz. More securely situated than the often-raided coastal towns, it served as a naval base and a market for the spoils of piracy and war. In 1168 the town was burned by the Fāṭimid vizier Shāwar to prevent its capture by AMALRIC I of Jerusalem. Already affected by repeated plagues and famines, unrest, and increasing competition from neighboring Cairo (founded 969), it did recover somewhat, but by the 13th C. was no longer of much importance.

LIT. S.D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 5 vols. (Los Angeles-Berkeley 1967–86). W. Kubiak, *Al-Fustāt* (Warsaw 1982). G.T. Scanlon, *The Fustāt Expedition: Final Report* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1986).

—L.I.C.